

THE  
CHRISTIAN QUARTERLY.

VOL. VI.

JAN.—OCT., 1874.

---

Πάντα δοκιμάζετε· τὸ καλὸν κατέχετε.—1 THESS. V, 21.

---

EDITOR.

W. T. MOORE,

PASTOR OF CENTRAL CHRISTIAN CHURCH, CINCINNATI.

ASSOCIATE EDITORS.

W. K. PENDLETON,

*President of Bethany College, West Virginia.*

ISAAC ERRETT,

*Editor of Christian Standard, Cincinnati.*

ROBERT GRAHAM,

*Presid't of Hocker Female College, Lexington, Ky.*

DR. S. E. SHEPARD,

*Pastor of Church of Christ, Troy, Penn.*

THOMAS MUNNELL,

*Cor. Sec'y General Chris. Miss. Convention.*

ALEXANDER PROCTOR,

*Pastor of Church of Christ, Independence, Mo.*

---

CINCINNATI:

W. T. MOORE, PUBLISHER.

1874.

P 226

Entered, according to Act of Congress, in the year 1874,

BY W. T. MOORE,

In the Office of the Librarian of Congress, at Washington.







THE  
CHRISTIAN QUARTERLY.

---

JANUARY, 1874.

---

I.—MOSAISM AND CHRISTIANITY.

IT is intended to present in this paper a general view of the nature of the Christian religion, especially as it appears when contrasted with the dispensation of Moses, which preceded it, and was preparatory to it. The standing-ground for the entire view shall be, as nearly as possible, that of the apostle Paul. To see Moses as he saw him, will be deemed altogether sufficient. To bring out clearly that side of Christian truth which is fully developed only in his writings, shall be an aim not lost sight of in a single line.

It is generally admitted that there have been three distinct periods of religious development in history, called, sometimes, the starlight, moonlight, and sunlight ages of the world. But it is not so generally understood, perhaps, that these ages stand in a certain necessary relation to each other, so that, in the very nature of things the starlight must come first, and be succeeded by the other two in the order here named. Such, however, the understanding, upon reflection, discovers to be the fact. The Patriarchal period is first; the Jewish is a development from that; and, finally, Christianity is evolved from Judaism. Over all the causes and influences which may possibly become factors in human life through the many generations, during which the progressive unfolding of inspired truth goes on, an all-wise and ever-merciful Providence ceaselessly presides. Jehovah is every-where—in every thing. To holy men, who alone have eyes

to see them, the Spirit of God gradually pushes aside the veil, and opens the wide realms which lie beyond the limits of unaided sense.

In nature, nothing is in vain. In grace or redemption, the principle is certainly not less sound. God did not reveal himself to man "in many parts and in many ways," just because he was sovereign, and chose to do so, but because in man's nature there was a necessity which demanded it, and to which God's method was adjusted with careful adaptation and infinite skill. The evidences of design which, in nature, proclaim to us the being and perfections of Jehovah, are not wanting in the economy of salvation. The order of the ages, the general structure and special adaptations of the remedial system, declare to us the presence of God, no less than "the firmament which showeth his handiwork." The starlight and moonlight ages, then, were preparatory. In the present investigation this much will be assumed, and the intelligence of the reader trusted for the acceptance of the position. The Christian religion, as the final outcome of the Patriarchal and Jewish ages, is regarded as the fully unfolded counsel of Jehovah. To use the expression of our great commentator on the law, who was, at the same time, the most learned proclaimer of the primitive Gospel, it is "the wisdom of God." In the way of introduction, this, it is hoped, may suffice.

I. Law and gospel are important terms; important because they represent grand, distinct, generic conceptions of the relations of Jehovah and his creature, man. One can not too soon set about obtaining a proper apprehension of the fundamental ideas embodied in words which stand for themes so vast. At the present moment it is not thought best to tread upon debatable ground. "Law" is the voice of authority. A "gospel" is a message of love. The one comes to you with penalties to arouse your fears; the other seeks to win you with accents of tenderness and compassion. In law, there is no grace. Not that the two things are so opposed that they can not exist together in the same religion. It is not intended to start now a question of this sort. The truth, it may be hoped, will appear as the argument progresses. In law, there is no grace. In Gospel, grace is, to say the least, the chief thing. In whatever else men may differ, in this they are one. Meantime, it is thought best to pay special attention to the idea of law. It is the idea we are seeking.

We have the word, and we want the thing. If the whole complex thing which this word represents is once properly fixed in the understanding, then our contemplated work will move smoothly forward. When one has an idea in his mind, and has a word so definite and so exhaustive of the idea that when the word is pronounced the idea is transferred, in its totality and in the just proportion of its elements, to the mind of another, then may the communication of thought be perfectly effected. But when a word means one thing to A, and another to B, or if it only means less to A than it does to B, it is quite plain that A and B will never be able to understand each other when that word is employed as a vehicle for the transmission of thought. When a word means precisely the same thing to both A and B, then they will understand each other in the use of that word. When this is not the case, such an understanding is not possible. What we want, then, is the idea for which the word *law* stands in Scriptural currency. Every thing depends upon obtaining this. A mere dictionary conception will not answer our purpose. We may use a dictionary, indeed, but only as a help to something beyond. Neither is it desired to find a generic expression, which shall include all special applications, and stand as an exhaustive view of its meaning. It is doubted whether this is possible. Certainly no attempt yet made, within the writer's knowledge, has been at all satisfactory. Language is determined by use rather than philosophy. And however much it may offend our sense of what ought to be, we must, in words no less than things, accept facts as they really exist. We want, then, the meaning of this word *law*, as it is used in the Scriptures. Let metaphysics, for the present, be cast aside. We wish to go and stand by the side of Paul, the aged. We wish to get precisely his angle of vision; to look back at the dispensation of Moses as he looked back at it; to get out of the word *law* precisely what there was in it to him when others used it, and precisely what he meant to put into it when *he* used it; to relate Moses and Christ, and their respective systems, precisely as they stood related in Paul's mind. When the whole religious world shall stand on this high plane, then will it be fairly on the way to achievements which may well fill earth and heaven with holy joy. What, then, is the idea of law, as it lay in the mind of Paul? To this question we now give our undivided attention.

1. In seeking Paul's conception of law, it may be safely held that there was the notion of governmental authority expressing itself in the form of commandment. It is not meant, as the reader no doubt perceives, that this notion exhausts his idea, but only that it enters into it, and forms part of it. Whatever else may be thought necessary to the totality of the conception, this is plainly and undeniably included. A few quotations, to bring this fact clearly before the reader, will not be thought amiss: "But sin, taking occasion by the *commandment*, wrought in me all manner of concupiscence." "For without *law*, sin is dead."\* "And I was alive without *law* once; but when the *commandment* came, sin revived, and I died." "Sin, taking occasion by the *commandment*, deceived me, and by it slew me." "So that the *law* is holy, and the *commandment* holy, and just, and good." Let these passages suffice. They are only specimens of a very large class, and are quite decisive as to the point now under consideration. The view here brought out, it may be added, is also in exact harmony with that which constantly meets us in the Psalms: "The *statutes* of the Lord are right, rejoicing the heart; the *commandment* of the Lord is pure, enlightening the eyes." "O, how I love thy *law*! it is my meditation all the day." "Thou, through thy *commandments*, hast made me wiser than mine enemies." "I have inclined my heart to perform thy *statutes*, always, even unto the end." Passages might be greatly multiplied, but there can be no necessity for it. With David, as with Paul, the idea of governmental authority, expressing itself in *statute* or *commandment*, is ever present when law is mentioned.

Let it be distinctly noted, that the idea here brought out is not simply that of a moral principle lying in the mind and will of the great Lawgiver, and inhering in the nature of human relations; but that of a principle put into commandment, of authority actually embodied in a statutory provision. Not that such a use of the word is inadmissible; for writers on morals constantly use it in this sense. But we are seeking now for the meaning of the term in the Scriptures; and, with this object before the mind, the fact mentioned can not be too much insisted on. The reader will please bear it in mind to the close of this investigation.

\*In the omission of the article, the version of the A. B. U. is followed throughout this essay.

2. In Paul's conception of law, there is clearly another notion; namely, that of statute, expressing obligation, and presenting a rule of life. This will be recognized as something ever prominent: "By law is the knowledge of sin." And again: "The law worketh wrath; for where no law is, there is no transgression." And further: "There is no respect of persons with God. For as many as have sinned without law, shall also perish without law; and as many as have sinned in [or with] law, shall be judged by law; for not the hearers of the law are just before God, but the doers of the law shall be justified." "Now we know that whatever things the law saith, it saith to them that are under the law; that every mouth may be stopped, and all the world become guilty before God." But there is no need to go farther. To quote every thing in point would be to transcribe a very large part of Paul's Epistles. In Paul's idea of law, it is beyond denial that we have the notion of governmental authority expressed in statute or commandment; and also the further notion of the statute, or commandment, imposed as a rule of life. He uses the word, not to express "will" merely, but governing authority. This difference is very important; so important, let it be said, that the subject can not be understood, unless it be clearly apprehended and accepted as true. Again, it is not held that law is commandment, or statute, offered for voluntary acceptance as a rule of life; but commandment governmentally imposed as such—commandment made a rule of life, whether accepted as such or not. It is of the nature of law that the will of those to whom it is given is not consulted. This distinction is believed to be of the very highest importance, and should never be lost sight of by any one who would know the relations of Mosaism and Christianity, or understand wherein one is different from the other.

3. The idea of penalty following infraction belongs necessarily to a system of law. The conception of sovereignty, of commandment sovereignly imposed as a rule of life, clearly implies and includes penalty as a consequence of transgression. That Paul so understood the matter, need not be argued here at all. The fact lies on the very surface of his letters, and may be taken as universally admitted.

4. The power of law over those placed under it, is brought to bear upon them solely from without. Law has no power to renew the heart, to originate a new life. The relation of law to life is regulative

entirely. It is impossible to exaggerate the value of this statement. Till this truth is clearly perceived, the real glory of the religion of Christ is absolutely shut out from the soul. Some of the profoundest passages in the Roman Letter owe their origin and meaning to it. To tell men what they ought to do, is one thing; to incline them to do it, is a very different thing. To give a commandment showing men how they ought to live, is well; but to give them the power to obey the commandment, is better still. That law has no power otherwise than from without, is the reason, in part at least, why no system of law-keeping can save men. This is why life and righteousness are not within the sphere of law.

5. Law knows nothing of mercy. It thunders, "Thou shalt!" and "Thou shalt not!" It has no milder voice. It is a stranger to all gentle sympathies. "If even a beast touch the mountain, it shall be stoned." Transgression is hopeless ruin. "The soul that sinneth it shall die." "The wages of sin is death." The religion of the Jews was not a pure legalism; for even in Moses there was the "shadow," only the shadow, of mercy: and in a pure legalism not even that is possible. The language of law is brief and terse. Obey, and live; disobey, and die. This is its only utterance. "I set before you," says Moses, "life and death; a blessing and a curse." Life, if you continue in all things written in the law to do them; death, if you fail. Not death without repentance and forgiveness, but death without mercy. Even under Moses, for certain sorts of offenses, there was forgiveness. Yet Moses was so far true to the nature of a strict legalism, that whoever despised his law died, "WITHOUT MERCY, under two or three witnesses." The rewards and punishments of the law, as such, were all temporal. Even the legal forgiveness was mercy only in a most shadowy sense. "For the law having the SHADOW of the good things to come, not the very image of the things, can never with the same sacrifices which they offer year by year continually make those who come to them perfect." Its forgiveness was simply the forgiveness of the State. God forgave, when the required sacrifices were offered, but only as the head of the theocratic institution,

All the mercy that has come to men, under any dispensation, has come through Christ. If this is not true, the Christian religion is utterly without a logical basis. It is an edifice built upon pillars of sand. "The law," says Paul, "was added because of transgressions,



till the seed should come to whom the promise was made." "Added," let it be inquired, to what? Certainly to something that was before it. But to what? The question comes back. To the remedial system, to God's mercy given men in Christ. To the most wise and gracious economy of salvation, which began with the Fall, and has continued in force ever since; which was before the law, and was not "annulled" by the law; which, since the law has been taken out of the way, stands forth, in the full revelations of the Gospel, as the wisdom of the infinite God, and as the light and life of a stricken and groaning world.

The Jew, in rejecting Christ, denied, virtually, his need of mercy. Not, perhaps, that he meant to do it, but that in logic he did it. He saw not the relation of Christ to the Divine clemency, as Christian men can see it now. He supposed that his own law contained provision for all the mercy he needed. If he could so live as to avoid the stones of the legal executioners, he imagined his righteousness would be equal to the demands of the Judgment-day. But, since all mercy comes through Christ, when Christ is rejected, mercy is rejected too. There are but two possible attitudes for men before the bar of God. In one of these, men are put on their own merits; they stand on their "own righteousness, which is by law." The other is very different; it is that of men confessing guilt, but claiming mercy in Christ. Of these two possibilities, the Jew elected the former. The apostle, therefore, is strictly logical, when, in the argument of the Roman Letter, he puts him under a stern, unbending law. In his rejection of Christ he had put himself, whether intentionally or not, on this plane; and the apostle holds him rigidly to his chosen ground. Moses recognized no atonement for open violations of the Decalogue. Every such transgression received what was, from his stand-point, a "just recompense of reward." In such cases, mercy was not even to be thought of.

But "apart from law," even during the reign of the law, was there really no mercy? Was the compassion of Jehovah absolutely shut up from the world? Were the men of the nations that knew not the God of Israel, passing, generation after generation, in solemn procession, every one, into blackness and darkness without end? Did every guilty, trembling culprit, executed without mercy under the law, move on, however penitent and heart-broken, to the horrors of the second

death? Believe it who can. It may be well to listen to David. He was a great sinner, but not a reckless and defiant one. Crushed and broken in spirit, he breathes out the burden of his soul in song. "Purge me with hyssop, and I shall be clean; wash me, and I shall be whiter than snow." "Hide thy face from my sins, and blot out all mine iniquities." "Cast me not away from thy presence, and take not thy Holy Spirit from me." "Thou desirest not sacrifice, else would I give it." "Thou delightest not in burnt offering." "The sacrifices of God are a broken spirit; a broken and a contrite heart, O God, thou wilt not despise."

The relations of the Mosaic legalism to the remedial system by Christ Jesus are not well understood. David was struggling and hoping for mercy not recognized in the law. He felt in his soul the utter inadequacy of all legal offerings. They were not even professedly for him. "Sacrifice thou dost not desire." "A broken and contrite heart thou wilt not despise." There has always been "a righteousness apart from law" accessible to the children of men. Otherwise there was not even the shadow of hope. No sinner was ever saved by law. By law is the knowledge of sin.

6. In a pure legalism, righteousness consists in doing perfectly the things written in the law. Those who have this righteousness can claim justification by law. To none else is such justification possible. In the absence of this righteousness, law only condemns. The intelligent student of the Scriptures needs not be told that much of Paul's reasoning in his Letter to the Christians at Rome, is based on this most evident truth. From this especially comes that sweeping conclusion, than which no decision of inexorable logic is more certain: "Therefore, by deeds of law there shall no flesh be justified in his sight."

"Moses describes," says Paul, "the righteousness which is of the law, that the man which doeth these things shall live by them." He "describes" or tells the nature of it. From the very nature of legal righteousness, therefore, arises the impossibility of justifying or saving a sinner by law. To bring salvation within the reach of a *sinner*, "a righteousness apart from law" is an absolute necessity. To make this matter evident is the chief thing aimed at in Paul's discussions with the Jews. Moreover, it must be clear that the difficulty here presented is one which inheres in the very nature of things.



What the law of Moses could not do, it must be seen, is equally impossible to any other law. It is no betterment of a sinner's condition to transfer him from Moses to Christ, if the principle of justification is in both cases the same. If the authority of one law is taken away, only that another may be established, then is nothing gained. The administration of Christ must differ in principle from that of Moses, otherwise salvation is yet impossible. Let none blunder when the way is so very plain. In seeking for Paul's conception of law, or of any legalism, in its application to men as a basis of justification, the following elements, then, have been obtained, and are here presented together, that the mind may take them all in at a single glance:

1. Governmental authority expressed in statute.
2. The authority so expressed, a rule of life.
3. Penalty following infraction.
4. Its entire force is from without. It seeks to accomplish nothing by establishing a principle within.
5. It is utterly inflexible, and knows no mercy.
6. Its righteousness is perfect obedience to the things which are written.

This is offered as an analysis of the apostle's conception of law. It is not claimed that it is exhaustive, or that the points are so well put as they might have been. If no violence is done to truth, the most precious of all gems, the writer is content. Beyond this, he is not conscious of any special solicitude. And now, that this is not what man in his helplessness needs, is the plainest of all the questions to-day before the minds of men. There must be something other and better than this, or the door of heaven is closed against him forever. Blessed be God, it is not so closed!

II. We come now to look at the Gospel. We shall still stand by the side of Paul, and shall be only too happy if we may but catch the glories of the new institution as they unfold to his vision. Paul was the apostle to the nations which were not in covenant with God. And, as such, it is only natural that the side of the Christian religion which contrasts it most sharply with Jewish or legalistic forms of thought, should have been revealed to the world through him. From the very nature of his apostolic mission he was brought into

constant contact not only with unbelieving Jews, but also with intensely legalistic Jews, who claimed at the same time to be Christians. To this fact we are indebted, no doubt, for a very large part of what he wrote. This accounts, too, for that peculiar phase of thought which runs through all his letters, and has been denominated, by some, the Pauline view of Christianity. It is, in truth, simply that side of Christianity which lay nearest to Paul, and upon which, therefore, his eyes were most constantly fixed. The habits of his own mind, both from organization and the training he had undergone, as well as the nature of his work, tended, no doubt, to give this direction to his thinking. This is, of course, only a suggestion as to the causes operating from the human side. The presence of the Spirit of God in his holy inspirations is fully admitted. It is intended, as has been intimated, to present here, for the most part, only such views as may be thought necessary to bring this Pauline conception of the Gospel fully before the readers of the *QUARTERLY*.

1. The Gospel, it is sometimes said, embraces facts, commandments, and promises. This, indeed, is the generalization usually adopted among the Disciples, and its correctness need not be here called in question. As a statement of the objective side of the Christian religion, it might not be easy to improve upon it. Of these three divisions or categories of things, it is not pretended that more than one can be properly considered as having the nature of law. The "facts" and the "promises" are excluded by any possible definition. It is held by some, however, that a legal side of the Gospel is found in its commandments. It may be well to move cautiously here. Cautiously, let it be said, not in the fear of censorious critics, but cautiously as in the interests of truth.

It is not claimed that, in passing over from Moses to Christ, men leave behind them authority and obligation. Neither is it held that they have no longer any outward rule of life, and are left to follow simply the impulses moving them from within. Nothing can be farther from the view really entertained than this. It is distinctly admitted and firmly held, that the requirements of the Gospel have in them all Divine authority and the highest possible obligation; but it is believed, at the same time, that the nature of redemption is such as to take these commandments off the legal plane, and to put them on a much higher and grander one. It will be seen at once that there lies at

the basis of this view the whole conception of law, as Paul understood it, and as the reader has seen it in the foregoing pages. If by law is meant no more than an authoritative and binding rule of life, then, certainly, the requirements of the Gospel may, fitly enough, be considered as falling within that category. But this is not Paul's understanding of the matter. This is not, save in an exceptional instance perhaps, his use of the word. That he never applies it in this way to the conditions of forgiveness, shows that, from his point of view, it would be entirely incongruous to do so. The single fact here mentioned speaks volumes to a thoughtful man.

2. In studying the Christian religion from the Pauline stand-point, and therefore with especial reference to the points of contrast between it and the system of Moses, or any other possible legalism, we are met by a fundamental difference lying at the very threshold of our investigations. The objects of the two schemes are not at all the same. It is no part of the intention of a system of law to save sinners. In such a scheme the parties placed under it are assumed to begin righteous, and to remain so until the law is violated. Statute has no power over any one till it is made statute. The State enacts a law to-day, but no man can be tried by that law for an offense committed yesterday. The authority of law, therefore, can not antedate its own existence. In law, then, it is proposed to take a just man, or one who is assumed to be just, and to so regulate his life by the letter of the statute that he may remain just forever. The man who so lives can be saved. The man that fails loses every thing.

In the Gospel, the very first appeal, it is plain, is made to sinners. Moses put sinners to death without mercy. Christ offers to them forgiveness and life. He came to seek and save the lost. Not the whole need a physician, but they that are sick. God gave the law through Moses, but it was no part of his expectation to save men by it. "Wherefore, then, serveth the law?" "It was added because of transgression, till the seed should come to whom the promise was made." "The law was our pedagogue to lead us to Christ." "If a law had been given which was able to make alive, truly righteousness would have been by law." Jehovah was not disappointed. He knew that law could not give life, and, therefore, never ordained it for that purpose. It could give "the knowledge of sin." It could

show sin to be "exceeding sinful." It could plant the consciousness of guilt and helplessness in the soul. In this way, like the slave that led his master's child to school, it could lead men to Christ. This was its office. This was all that Moses could do. Under Christ, it is proposed to take a sinner, a transgressor of law—one whom law condemns and would put to death without mercy—and justify him, and save him in heaven, yet maintain the just authority of Jehovah, and secure all the ends of his government over angels and men. Differing, then, as Moses and Christ plainly do, in the very start, it is certain they must differ correspondingly to the end. Law says, "Thou shalt not kill." The Gospel says, "He came into the world to save sinners, of whom I am chief." Law says, "The soul that sinneth, it shall die." The Gospel says, "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life." Law says, "Cursed is he that continueth not in all things written in the book of the law to do them." The Gospel says, "Repent and be baptized, every one of you, upon my name, for remission of sins, and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit."

3. The Gospel recognizes the necessity of voluntariness as an element in a really noble life. It addresses the understanding, the affections, the will. The only obedience which it respects is an obedience which springs from an honest acceptance of the Messiah, and an unreserved surrender of the heart and life to him. Law, as has been shown, does not do this. After the generation which entered into covenant with God at Sinai had passed away, every Jew was "born under law, born under its obligations, and exposed to its penalties." His will was not consulted. He had no election in the matter at all. The generation which covenanted at Sinai acted for their descendants in all generations. They accepted the covenant, and it was bound upon their children forever. Under Christ, each acts for himself alone. The representative theory is not known in the new covenant. Every soul must individually accept Christ, or perish forever. The life of a Christian is, on the ground of its voluntariness, the life of a freeman, not that of a trembling slave. "Thou shalt," is the language of law. "He that believeth and is baptized," is the style of the Gospel. These two forms of expression stand for fundamental characteristics of the two schemes. In one, men are driven under the lash of outward authority. In the other,

the voluntary consent of the soul being first won, they move forward freely and joyously in the light of the truth.

4. From a strictly legalistic plane, the statute must be regarded as the source of obligation as well as the rule of life. Your true legalist has no right, in any case, to look behind the commandment. But, in point of fact, even in law the real source of obligation lies behind the statute. It may be said, "This is admitted; but the real source of obligation is the sovereign will, of which the statute is only a formal expression." But this, too, is short of the mark. The will of God is not an autocratic impulse. It is not, in any case, one of twenty things, of which it might as well have been another. There are reasons underlying the will of God, as there are reasons underlying the will of a man. God can only will, with reverence it is said, in harmony with changeless and eternal truth. Truth inheres in his nature, and he can not deny himself. The real source of obligation, therefore, is truth. Truth was before law, and is greater than law. Statutes are for the times and for the people to whom they are given. Truth and its obligations are for all times and all peoples. Men were under the obligations which spring from truth, before any statute was made. Cain was before Moses, yet not without responsibility. Against what statute did Cain offend when he murdered his brother? It were well if over this question some should pause and reflect. The heathen, who had no law, were a law unto themselves; that is, they were under the obligation which springs from truth, and were responsible in the exact ratio of their means of knowing it. Truth is ever the voice of God to the soul. His authority is in it, however obtained; whether from the book which we call the Bible, or from the intuitions of the soul, and its feeble attempts to decipher the characters dimly traced on the wide scroll of the universe. All truth is of God. His will and truth ever coincide. Antagonism here is not possible. The statute is not always a perfect expression of Jehovah's will. Moses allowed a "writing of divorcement;" but Jesus says, "It was not so from the beginning." "Moses permitted it because of the hardness of your hearts." The law, in this case, it is plain, was a condescension to human weakness, and did not express the real will of God at all. It was simply the best that was possible in the Jewish state. The source of obligation, then, is truth—truth, which, however obtained,

always coincides with the will of God, and voices his authority to the souls of men. The measure of truth attainable in any given case is, in that case, the rule of life and ground of accountability. "This is the condemnation, that light has come into the world, and men love darkness rather than light." Before this utterance of the Great Teacher the murky dogmas of men recede forever. Wherever light (truth) is, there is accountability. The measure of accountability is always the measure of light enjoyed. To this there can be no exception in any age, in any land.

5. The law assumed as its fundamental conception, that Jehovah, the Creator, is the rightful ruler of men. It proposed government simply. The idea of redemption is not in the law as a basis of its requirements. There is not a commandment in the Decalogue which would not have been just as applicable to men that had never sinned. From the stand-point of Moses and Israel there was no Christ even in its typical ritual. Of course, it was otherwise on the Divine side; but that matters not at present. Its obligations, therefore, were grounded, not in the nature of redemption, but in original relations between Jehovah and his creature, man. There is not a commandment in the entire law of Moses which really looks to the recovery of a sinner from the guilt and dominion of sin. In that direction statute has not even the semblance of fitness or value. In the presence of sin it is utterly powerless. In law, God speaks to man as Creator and Ruler. Its plane is governmental, simply. In the Gospel, the idea of redemption is interwoven throughout. Its provisions and its requirements both look in that direction. Here, then, are two things entirely distinct from each other. Apart from redemption, men are necessarily under a dispensation of law. From redemption, however, that idea is excluded, and there is introduced, instead of it, the idea of grace. In this sense, law and grace are clearly set over against each other by the apostle Paul. But let it be granted, for the present, that law may exist in a remedial economy. Still, law is not in itself remedial. Clearly, this much must be conceded. That which has in it the remedial value and efficacy, is something which can not, under any definition, be called law. Law, in its widest range and wisest form, was possible without Christ. But without Christ there was no remedy for human guilt. Conceive of God's moral government as though Christ, and the grace of God through



him, were subtracted from it, and you will have, then, simply the reign of law. God's authority as Creator and Ruler remains; and whatever is possible without grace and redemption also remains. That which has its origin in the system of redemption through Christ Jesus, then, does not, according to the Pauline conception, belong to the category of law. Law has its origin in relations which would still exist if Christ and redemption were removed. But the requirements of the Gospel have their origin in the remedial system itself. They belong to that system as a part of it. But for the existence of that system, there could be no place for them. They have their roots in its very nature, and grow up thence, as a tree springs from the bosom of the earth. All requirements, therefore, which clearly belong to this class, lie entirely outside the proper domain of law. They take their character from the nature of the economy to which they belong.

"But moral obligation," it may be said, "is, under all circumstances, the same." "The commandments of the Decalogue, not as commandments of the Decalogue, but as comprehended in the 'sayings' of Christ, are certainly binding still." This is most freely granted. But then the relation of the Christian to these "sayings" is very different from that which Israel, under the law, sustained to the law; so very different that Paul, with the full knowledge of this obligation, and confessing it in its holiest sense, does, nevertheless, expressly assert that Christians "are not under law, but under grace." What Paul expressly says, it were well if all who call themselves Christians would believe.

6. But the Gospel, it has been said, makes its first appeal to sinners. It offers to them forgiveness of sins and eternal life, not as a reward for years of faithful law-keeping, but as a free boon, as a most merciful bestowment from God. Yet the Gospel does not, unconditionally, make this offer. On the contrary, it is expressly stipulated that the sinner shall voluntarily submit to certain requirements which it makes at his hands. The gracious boon is offered in the name of Christ. The sinner must "believe" in him. "Upon his name," he must "repent and be baptized for remission of sins." Upon a hearty compliance herewith, he is assured that his iniquities shall be forgiven, and that he himself shall be graciously accepted as a child of God. In this new relation he is not under the reign of law, but under an administration of favor.

In order to entrance into this new and gracious relation to God, it will be seen, there are three steps to be taken. Not three distinct works of law to be performed. That would be a totally different and most unevangelical conception. Each one of these steps has its origin and necessity in the nature of the remedial system. In a system of law there is no place for a single one of the three. Has this undeniable fact been altogether overlooked? Or has its significance been simply disregarded? The sequel of pending investigations may, perhaps, disclose the answer. A close look at these requirements will, it is believed, enable the reader to satisfactorily determine their position. "And, first, concerning faith. What of that?"

Faith does not lie within the pale of law. It is distinctly assigned by the apostle to another category. "The law is not of faith; but he that doeth these things shall live by them." This is just as if he had said, "Law and faith are not the same in their nature; they do not admit of being classed together at all." This, indeed, to every one who understands him, is precisely what he does say. Government presupposes, in a sense, the existence of faith. In the Divine government, a recognition of its authority, and the faith in its existence which recognition implies, is clearly a presupposition. Human governments require men not to believe, but to obey. So, when God put Israel under law, he did not begin with a statute commanding them to believe. The existence of faith, in the sense here required, was assumed. Faith, then, even in this lowest sense, does not fall within the sphere of law. But this conception of faith is so far beneath that of the Gospel as scarcely to be worthy of consideration in the present connection. The faith of the Gospel, as every one understands, is not simply a belief in the existence of God, but the heart's acceptance of Jesus Christ. The Jews believed in God; nay, they had, in many instances, a burning zeal for him; but they did not believe in Christ. Deists in our own time believe in a God, yet do not believe in Christ. When Paul speaks of faith in connection with human justification, he always means faith in the Lord Jesus. To him there was no saving value in any other faith. But faith in the Son of God clearly presupposes the existence of the entire remedial economy through him. Conceive of Christ and the scheme of redemption as subtracted from the Divine government, and Gospel faith becomes instantly impossible. The nature of this faith is



such, therefore, that it can have no existence save as part of a remedial economy. It has no place anywhere else. It is necessary, in order to put men into such relations with a system of redemption as will enable them to enjoy its advantages; but could not, on any other ground, be required of them. It belongs, then, clearly, not to an economy of law, but to one of grace and mercy. Law is not of faith; faith is not of law. The two things are wholly and forever distinct.

And what of repentance? Does *it* belong to the region of law? What is *its* place? It ought not to be difficult to answer this question. What has law to do with repentance? What has law to do with the transgressor, but to see that he is punished? Clearly nothing at all. Law knows not of mercy and forgiveness, and why should it speak of repentance? Though the transgressor weep tears of blood, law is not satisfied; but still inexorably demands "the just recompense of reward." Were a man arraigned before a human court, charged with murder, would any one think of instituting an inquiry into the state of his heart? With this the court has nothing to do. The law says nothing of penitence—has indeed nothing to say. It demands to know whether the crime has been committed, and then justifies or condemns with absolute inflexibility. In the Divine government, whatever may be said of other governments, repentance can have no place save in an economy of grace. Hence, God is said to give or grant repentance. When God, therefore, commands repentance, it is not in the capacity of lawgiver, but of Savior, that he makes the demand. It looks not to the punishment of the sinner, but to his salvation. There may be those who will say they can not understand these things. If such there be, the fact is to be regretted, no doubt, but can not be helped. Truth is still truth, notwithstanding all the ignorance, real or affected, there is in the world. It is not against the position here taken that God required the Jews, under the old covenant, to repent. It was no more a legal requirement then than now. There was no *statute* demanding it. It was then, as now, part of the system of mercy which has been in force with God, though not understood on earth, ever since man sinned. It has always had its place in connection with that righteousness "apart from law" which has ever been accessible to an otherwise helpless race.

Baptism is not a work of law. It is not said a work of the law, meaning thereby the law of Moses; for this could not be pretended by any one. Baptism is not a work of law at all. The failure to make this fact clear has often exposed the Disciples to the batteries of their adversaries, when discussing the connection of baptism with remission of sins. If baptism is held as a requirement of law, it is clear the doctrine of baptism for remission of sins is open to the full force of Paul's objection to the position of the Jews, who sought justification upon legal grounds. To escape this conclusion is logically impossible. Any attempt to do it exposes him who makes it to the ridicule of every man that knows what Paul's argument is. But baptism is not a work of law. Its necessity arises out of the nature of the Christian religion. It has its place here, and is unmeaning elsewhere. It expresses faith in Christ. It is grounded on his death, burial, and resurrection; so that, in baptism, the believer is buried with him and raised with him. It confesses sin, and engages to a new life. It says, "The old sinful life ends here, and a new life begins." On the part of the sinner it is a covenant, and pledges a relinquishment of sin. On the part of God it is a covenant, and pledges the forgiveness of sins. The baptized believer enters a new world, begins a new life, spotless as to guilt as an angel in heaven. Whatever may be the sentence pronounced in the Judgment-day, the sins of the old life shall not be mentioned to him. "Their sins and iniquities," says God, "I will remember no more." Baptism is an immersion, simply because these meanings can be put into nothing else.

The meanings of baptism, then, determine its position and classification. Moses had no use for it. The thought which finds expression in it was impossible to a mere lawgiver. This takes it from the plane of law, and puts it upon that of grace. Faith, repentance, and baptism, then, are not works of law. They are the wise and merciful appointments of an administration of favor. They are required, not because the honor of Jehovah as a Lawgiver demands them, but because they are steps to the ground where forgiveness may properly be bestowed.

Very strangely it has happened that many, while denouncing the language of Ashdod, and urging a return to a pure speech, have unconsciously fallen into the very condemnation which they have so

unsparingly denounced against others. The New Testament knows nothing of a "law of pardon." You could as easily find in that book all the barbarous terminology of the scholastics. It is as utterly unbiblical as "getting religion." It is the outcropping of a false conception, on one side, of the genius of the Gospel. It distinctly reveals an Old Testament mode of thought. It is as Jewish, both in form and sense, as, "This shall be the law of the leper in the day of his cleansing." To one who comprehends the relations of Moses and Christ, it is an impossible expression.

7. The relations of faith, repentance, and baptism to remission of sins, are not the result of mere arbitrary appointment. Whether men understand it or not, God can demand nothing without an adequate reason. This is plain to all truly thoughtful men. But in this case the reasons are patent on the human side. The fitness of these requirements, in the position which God has assigned them, is as evident as the fitness of the commands of the Decalogue in their relations to the social life of the world. Neither is their connection with the remission of sins of such a nature that the demand must be, in all cases, absolutely inflexible. This is generally admitted; but the grounds of the admission do not appear to be well understood. Alexander Campbell once said, "The only absolutely essential condition of forgiveness is the blood of Christ." When faith is impossible, a man should know intuitively (if there be such a thing as an intuition) that faith will not be demanded. John Stuart Mill has said there may be worlds, for aught we know, where two and two are five. When a man can accept so impossible a statement as this, then, if he believe in Christianity at all—a thing quite unlikely, indeed—he may very well hold that God will send to hell, for want of faith in Christ, even those who have never heard his name. Let there be no misunderstanding here. Not a word is affirmed concerning the final destiny of the millions that know nothing about a Savior. It is affirmed, however, with a confidence which absolutely knows no limit, that God will condemn none for failing to believe in a Redeemer whose name, even, they have never heard. If any man can find comfort or edification in doubting this statement, he is heartily welcome, so far as the present writer is concerned, to enjoy it in the fullest measures possible to his nature. It were a pity to disturb the self-complacency of some persons with problems larger

than the periphery of the circle in which their understandings are wont to move.

The principle here suggested must have the same application to repentance and baptism that it has to faith. This is self-evident. Whatever modifications, touching the inflexibility of these requirements, the application of this principle demands, must therefore be unhesitatingly made. The conditions of forgiveness must be understood, indeed, as having relation rather to our human side of the question than to the Divine side. Certainly, they are related to the Divine side too; but not, as has been shown, in a way to imply positive inflexibility. They are rather the means through which we, on our side, come to THE KNOWLEDGE OF FORGIVENESS, than the unbending conditions without which God will not, in any case, bestow it. It were worth an entire article to elaborate this statement in all its bearings upon questions of great and constantly increasing interest. To have enunciated a principle so full of meaning, is, at this time, enough. It is felt that even this will not prove altogether in vain. Great seed-truths sown in honest hearts are certain, soon or late, to bear fruit. It is sweet to toil in this confidence.

8. Law, as has been shown, operates upon men only from without. Its authority, its pains and penalties, its emoluments and rewards, exhaust its means of influencing the life of the world. It seeks not to establish within the soul itself a germ from which a new and better life may come. And herein it falls immeasurably below the method pursued in the Gospel. The Son of God, in one of those remarkable analogies in which his teaching abounded, gives us to understand that his aim is directly at the hearts of men. "Are grapes gathered from thorns, or figs from thistles? Every good tree produces goodly fruit; but an unsound tree produces diseased fruit. A good tree can not produce diseased fruit; nor can an unsound tree produce goodly fruit. Therefore by their fruits you shall know them." The meaning of this, in plain, unfigurative language, is: "As a man's heart is, so will his life be." Christ, therefore, aims at the heart. If he can reach and purify that, then the result will be a pure life. But, to do this, he must establish his presence within the heart. The Gospel is indeed God's power; but Christ is the power of the Gospel. He who regards the Gospel as merely a series of propositions, to be perceived and accepted by the

understanding, is yet scarcely within the vestibule of Christ's great temple. To him the true glory of Christ has never been unveiled. The light of the knowledge of the glory of God as it is in the face of Christ, hath not truly shined into his heart. Life is motion. Behind motion is power. The Gospel is the power of God. But Christ, we again say, is the power of the Gospel. Behind all those yearnings of the soul, those hungerings and thirstings after righteousness, those mighty strugglings toward a higher and grander goal, of whose presence in the inner man every Christian is conscious, there are present, in every instance, the mystic forces gathered in the life and death of Christ. But the power which is in Christ is put into the hearts of men by faith in him. Let no one mistake here. Not by believing theories and doctrines is this power transferred to the souls of men, but by believing in Christ. The power is in Christ, and the faith which establishes his presence in the heart is faith in him. One may be very sound as to whether men are by nature totally depraved, as to whether faith is before repentance, as to whether baptism is a "positive institution," or whether it is for remission of sins, yet remain very much a stranger to the power which is in Christ the Lord. It is only as the vast significance of the life and death of Christ, in their relations to human guilt, are apprehended by the soul, that the power of the Gospel is realized within. So it is that Christ is "formed" in the heart. So, indeed, he "dwells" in his people, and becomes to them "the hope of glory." Thus, too, the Holy Spirit establishes his presence, and exerts his sanctifying power in the hearts of men. It were well for the world if mystical notions of the Holy Spirit were abandoned, and the reasonable doctrine of the Scriptures accepted in lieu of them. God's Spirit works mightily in the hearts of men, but always through faith in Christ. "Now, the LORD is that SPIRIT; and where the SPIRIT OF THE LORD is, there is liberty." "But we all, with open [unveiled] face, beholding as in a glass the GLORY OF THE LORD, are changed into the same image from glory to glory, even as by the SPIRIT OF THE LORD."

To the same general purport is the teaching of Paul in the following remarkable passage: "For the law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and death. For what the law could not do in that it was weak through the flesh,

God sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh; that the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit."

The law of the spirit of life, in this passage, is not the Gospel in its outward statement, but the Gospel in the heart, as a new force, as a holy germ, out of which comes a new and holy life. A little attention to the context will make this very evident. A little while before, the apostle had said: "I delight in the law of God after the inward man; but I see another law in my members warring against the law of my mind, and bringing me into captivity to the law of sin which is in my members." Now, plainly, the word *law* represents here, not an outward statute of any kind, but a force working from within, and dominating the life; or, rather, there are two such forces struggling against each other. One of these the apostle calls "the law of my mind," and the other he describes as "the law of sin which is in my members." Of course, the word *law* can not here have an objective signification. It is not to be supposed that any intelligent interpreter could think of such a thing. By "the law of my mind," it is clear the apostle means the inner force of judgment and conscience; while by "the law of sin which is in my members," he designates the force of passion and lust. But "the law of sin," in this text, is clearly the same as "the law of sin and death" in the passage under consideration. Since, then, "the law of sin and death" is simply an expression for the force of unholy passions within, it is certain "the law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus," which is set over against it, must be understood of an opposing force operating also from within. This yields us one of the profoundest, and at the same time grandest, truths in the New Testament. To all the forces looking in the direction of a better life, native to the human soul, the Gospel brings, as supplementary, every blessed influence which can be put into the soul through faith in Christ.

But "the law of the spirit of life" is not an abstract operation. Such a supposition is no nearer the truth than that of an outward statute. Neither mysticism nor legalism finds a friend in Paul. If he were here, he would pity or rebuke, according to his mood, both classes of interpreters. The phrase of the apostle is simply a



condensed expression, standing for all the regenerative forces which can be put into a human heart through faith in Christ. It is a bestowment over and above every thing which is possible under any legalism like that of Moses.

And that other wonderful expression, "That the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh but after the Spirit,"—what shall be said of that? Simply, that by means of the sublime forces introduced into the soul through faith in Christ, the righteousness which the law required, but failed, through weakness of the flesh, to effect, is realized in measures as grand as is possible in fallen men. The crown of the Gospel is, that it puts into the soul the power to realize, albeit in a very humble way, the grandeur of a life of which that of Jesus Christ is the only perfect representation the world has yet seen. It is not expected that every reader will enter into the full force of all these reasonings, or indeed, recognize the truth contained in them. But there are many who will; and the day hastens (so it is believed) when there shall be few whose judgment is entitled to respect, that will, in any essential aspect of the matter, dissent from them. First the blade, then the ear, and afterward the full corn in the ear.

9. The righteousness of law is, in the nature of things, the righteousness of works; but the righteousness of the Gospel is expressly called "the righteousness of faith." This contrast is boldly drawn by Paul in numerous passages, of which the following may be taken as a specimen: "Nay, more, and I account all things to be loss for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus my Lord, for whom I suffered the loss of all things; and account them refuse, that I may gain Christ, and be FOUND IN HIM, not having MY OWN RIGHTEOUSNESS, WHICH IS OF LAW [he does not say *the* law], but that which is THROUGH FAITH IN CHRIST, THE RIGHTEOUSNESS WHICH IS OF GOD, UPON faith; that I may know him, and the power of his resurrection, and the fellowship of his sufferings, being conformed to his death; if by any means I may attain to the resurrection of the dead." This language differentiates the righteousness of the Gospel from that of any legalism conceivable by the human mind. The two conceptions differ in their essential nature. And no man can do justice to the Christian religion in whose understanding this difference is not clearly and sharply defined.

But the key to Paul's understanding of this subject is contained in the following passage, which, it is hoped, the reader will not pass without the most deliberate and prayerful study. "But now, apart from law, the righteousness of God hath been made manifest, being testified to by the law and the prophets; even the righteousness of God by faith of Jesus Christ unto all and upon all that believe; for there is no difference, for all sinned and came short of the glory of God; being justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus, whom God set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, for a manifestation of his righteousness because of the passing by of the former sins in the forbearance of God; with a view to the manifestation of his righteousness at the present time, that he might be seen to be just and the justifier of him who is of the faith of Jesus."

This passage embodies the great central thought of the remarkable document in which it is found. This once mastered, there may be isolated passages of difficult exegesis, but the general course of the argument is easily traced.

The one fact, however, to which the reader's attention is here especially called, is that the righteousness of the Gospel is "a righteousness apart from law," a righteousness with which law has positively nothing to do, "a righteousness which is of God through faith." This is the very heart of Paul's conception of a sinner's justification in Christ. Let the reader make no mistake. It is not that faith is in itself righteousness, but that it is accounted for righteousness through Christ; not that it is so accounted the instant the sinner believes, but so accounted when through faith he enters into covenant with Christ in baptism, engaging "to walk" with him henceforth in, "newness of life." The notion of justification instantly upon believing, and mystically witnessed by the Holy Spirit, as held in certain quarters, is, to say the least, as far from Paul's idea as is the semi-legalism which it is one object of this essay to overthrow. Truth is ever beset with errors on either hand. And happy is he who, teachable in spirit and patient in investigation, is content to follow her footsteps, through evil as well as good report, with a steadfast and never-faltering faith.

The reader's attention is solicited to another extract. It has, indeed, been partially considered already; but the idea was not brought



out as fully as the argument requires. In the revised Scriptures of the American Bible Union, it reads as follows: "For Moses describes the righteousness which is of the law, The man that has done them shall live by them. But the righteousness which is of faith says thus: Say not in thy heart, Who shall ascend into heaven? [that is, to bring Christ down;] or, Who shall descend into the abyss? [that is, to bring up Christ from the dead.] But what says it? The word is nigh thee, in thy mouth, and in thy heart; that is, the word of faith which we preach; because if thou shalt profess [confess] with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and believe in thy heart that God raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved. For with the heart man believeth unto righteousness; and with the mouth profession [confession] is made unto salvation."

The apostle here presents the idea which Moses himself had concerning legal righteousness. "The man," says Moses, "that doeth them shall live by them." This is simply the righteousness of works done, the only conception of righteousness which is possible from a strictly legalistic point of view. Over against this Mosaic conception, as a thing utterly unlike it, and belonging to another category entirely, the apostle places the Christian idea, "the righteousness of faith;" or "the righteousness which is through faith." This distinction relates clearly to the essential nature of the two things. In law, the work done is the righteousness; under Christ, the sinner's faith in him is "accounted" (set to his credit) for righteousness. This is, of course, a boon of mercy bestowed through Christ, and excludes boasting entirely. There should be no confounding of things so fundamentally distinct as the righteousness of law and the righteousness of faith.

10. It has now been made sufficiently evident (so it is believed), that the process of becoming a Christian is not one of obedience to law; that the things which a sinner is required to do are not, in any true sense, works of law; and that, having their origin and reason in the nature of a remedial economy, they are therefore to be held and classed simply as conditions of a dispensation of mercy. But a question may be here started as to the status of the justified man. What of him? Is he under law or not? That question, it is thought, may be best answered in the words of Paul. He will not be suspected of having entertained loose views regarding it. Or, if

any one suspect unsoundness in his case, it is not likely that a formal charge will be made against him. To the Christians at Rome Paul says, in plain words, "You are not under law, but under grace." To the Galatians he says: "But I say, Walk by the Spirit, and you will not fulfill the desires of the flesh. For the flesh has desires against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh; and these are contrary the one to the other, that you may not do those things that you would. But if you are led by the Spirit, you are not under law." This certainly ought to be satisfactory. Any attempt to explain the language here, as having sole reference to the law of Moses is the merest child's play imaginable; and betrays, let it be fraternally said, an utter failure to comprehend the general scope and bearing of the apostle's argument. But Paul does not mean that the Christian has no divine rule of life, that he may live as he lists, or that he may run heedless into all manner of sensual indulgence, and still find God's grace sufficient. Such consequence does not follow, save in the imaginations of men—of men, sometimes, of whom one would expect better things. All moral obligation, all the wise appointments of the reign of favor, however classed, are bound upon his heart by the solemn commandment of Christ, and can only be disregarded at the soul's everlasting peril. But he is not related to these commandments as is a man under law. He is not shut up to despair when, in his most earnest and heroic efforts, he still falls short of God's glory. There is mercy for him. Under law, there could be none. He is on another plane. He does not stand where righteousness consists only in doing perfectly the things which are written. God says: "Give me your heart." "Move forward in the life to which I call you; in the way that Jesus has gone before you; look not back, but go forward. You will encounter obstacles; you will be made to know the power of temptation; you will learn your own weakness; you will fail many times; you may be discouraged, for the struggle will often be fearful. But do not despair. There is no reason for it. You are not under law; you are under grace. Your weakness shall be supplemented by my strength; your failures shall become triumphs through my grace, provided you turn not back." "If any man turn back, my soul shall have no pleasure in him." Such, in general, is the tone and tenor of all New Testament teaching. We have in it the conception, not of one who goes forth

in his own strength, looking to the letter of a cold statute, on cold stone, and struggling for that which lies ever beyond his grasp ; but the conception of one in whom God works both to will and to perform ; whose inevitable failures are forgiven and swallowed up in the wealth of infinite love. These two things are as different as they well can be. One is the ideal of Moses, the other is that of Christ.

11. A few words more, and the reader's patience will not be longer taxed. The word *law* is used, in a few instances, in a sense somewhat different from that which is its common one in the New Testament. The apostle James speaks of "the law of liberty," and of "the perfect law of liberty." These expressions are admitted to refer to the Gospel. But this does not, as some might think, militate against the view here presented. That he qualifies the word as he does, shows that, from his point of view, which was much nearer to the Jewish legalism, than was that of Paul, it could not be so applied unqualifiedly, without manifest incongruity. This seems to be clear enough. Another view which may be mentioned will make it still more satisfactory. Of the several elements which enter into the idea of law, that of a rule of life is perhaps the most prominent ; at least, none, it may be safely said, is more prominent than that. It would, then, be very easy, and according to changes constantly taking place in the use of words, to apply the term *law*, with suitable qualifications (as James does), to the Gospel, when considered as a rule of life. Subtracting from the word all its meanings and implications, save the single one of a rule of life, there could, of course, be no impropriety in so using it. This is plainly what James does. The expression "law of liberty" would, on any other ground, be not only paradoxical, but absurd. The truth as revealed in the New Testament is, indeed, the Christian's rule of life ; but because of the power of his faith in Christ, it is no abridgment of his liberties. The life-force within and the regulative truth without coincide most perfectly. Essentially the same is Paul's use of the word in a single instance (1 Cor. ix, 21), which need not here be more than indicated, as a special examination is not considered necessary. There does not now occur to the writer another instance demanding notice.

12. If the general view presented in this essay needed further confirmation, it might be found in the fact that it encounters now

precisely the same objection it did when presented by Paul, so long ago. He wrote, "You are not under law, but under grace." He anticipates the objection, and hastens to meet it. He does not explain away his words by saying he only meant the law of Moses. On the contrary, he stands boldly by his well-matured deliverance. "Shall we sin because we are not under law, but under grace? Far be it. Know you not that to whom you yield yourselves servants to obey, his servants you are." That a Christian man is not under law, did not, as Paul understood it, in the least relax his obligation; nay, it rather magnified it. Wicked men may pervert the truth, and turn God's grace into licentiousness; but the world has a better assurance than law and penalty can give, that a Christian will be a true man. "How shall we that are dead to sin live any longer therein?" This is Paul's philosophy of the whole question in a nutshell. It is the crown of the Gospel that it can take away the love of sin. "This is the victory that overcomes the world, even our faith." "Who is he that overcomes the world but he that believes that Jesus is the Son of God?" "I have been crucified with Christ; and no longer do I live, but Christ lives in me; and the life which I now live in the flesh, I live in the faith of the Son of God who loved me, and gave himself for me. I do not set aside the grace of God; for if there be righteousness through law, then Christ died without cause."

Here let the argument rest. It is fearlessly submitted to the examination of candid Christian men. Nothing but truth is worthy of man's belief; and truth is safe while Jehovah lives.

## II.—NATURAL IMMORTALITY.

THE phrase that heads this paper needs no explanation. It is readily understood to refer to the differential between men and animals. It expresses the strongest desire of the soul, scarcely excepting that of continuing the present life. The thought of losing all consciousness forever, of resolving soul, body, and spirit into dust or rock, and of being distinguished, in cycles to come, only as a fossil for geologists of the year of our Lord 100,000 to speculate about, is enough to palsy every noble endeavor and halt the life-stream from our hearts. The petrified man recently discovered in the cave of Mentone, Italy, comes to a sudden notoriety, and is placed in a National Museum for the inspection of paleologists and other gazers at ancient curiosities. He now enjoys the reputation of having been a prehistoric character, about six feet high, of some notoriety among the admiring crowd, as the trinkets and ornaments lying about him demonstrated. Although not pre-adamite, the bones of the cave-lion, the cave-hyena, and other bones that grew in other ages, being found with him, throw him back toward the period of monkeydom believed in by Mr. Darwin. Notwithstanding this, his facial angle of eighty degrees, and other evidences of the highest human development, deny all kinship with that prehensile race. Being fully "in fashion as a man," his destiny as man is related to our own; and had we any wisdom among the wise that could decide his whereabouts to-day, it would be a welcome rift in the clouds to show us what eye hath not seen nor ear heard.

To gain this knowledge we have but two sources; we must learn it either from this world or from the spirit-world. It can not be fairly denied that this world has many elements of calculation for many things. We can estimate any distance of which we can find a parallax, any orbit of which we can obtain a very small arc, or solve almost any other problem of which we have the required data. In attempting a decision of the question of the natural immortality of man, the first thing to be determined is, whether the world contains the necessary elements of the calculation. If Robinson Crusoe was

the first visitant to that island, it is a question whether his man Friday, without books and without travel, had any means of knowing any thing about England, or whether he did not wholly depend upon information brought to his island home by one who knew the truth. To say that he was wholly destitute of the required data, and was therefore fixedly ignorant without foreign help, is too plain to require even a statement of the fact. Absolute isolation was the circumstance that specially described his condition. Without a bridge or a wire communicating with any continent, his inability to say any thing truthfully about it was as complete as could well be imagined.

This earthly home of ours, completely islanded in the immeasurable ether sea, has no causeway erected between us and heaven; we can erect no ladder even to the moon, nor establish any other physical means of communication with any other orb whatever; and regarding heaven as a distant, objective reality, the impossibility of knowing any thing accurately concerning it, without some heavenly visitant to teach us, is manifest to all. If any one has "descended," who "came forth from God," that we might "know the truth," and if we "believe his testimony," we may know the characters of the inhabitants of that world, the conditions of our admittance there, and whatever else our relations to eternity may demand. We depend upon travelers to Central Africa and other unknown regions for our knowledge of those climes, and believe their testimony because they have been there, and speak from actual observation and experience. Thus do we receive all our knowledge of places, and it is not unfair if we use the same method in determining the character of God and of those who shall be counted "worthy of that world" and of the resurrection from the dead.

While it will be freely admitted that our physical isolation from other worlds would necessitate an actual transit of a celestial teacher, provided this world furnished no data for estimating our eternal relations, it is promptly denied that the earth is so bankrupt in the elements of so important a calculation. Natural religion is invoked to prove the natural immortality of man, and our minds are directed to the vernal glories of the grass, the herb, and flower of the field, as pointing to a resurrection of the dead after the desolate Winter of the grave shall have passed. The soul that is looking for a sure



foundation for its hopes, seizes the beautiful illustration for a while, but afterward asks, What do autumnal chill, death, and Winter portend? If the one is a hint of eternal life, the other as significantly hints at eternal death. To say that the former illustrates the fact of eternal life, and the latter nothing but temporary death, would be a dictum too arbitrary to satisfy an independent thought. Next we are asked to note the growth of an acorn into an oak; to mark the bird's escape from its shell to cleave the heaven in disdain of its former confinement; and to consider the transition of the caterpillar into the glorified butterfly; and to see in all these developments the symbols of our own. It is encouraging to see how nature indorses this grand doctrine of the Bible; but the indorsement of a blank bond is not only useless but meaningless. God's promise of eternal inheritance is a bond that he will redeem in due time; but had not his word first filled the bond, its indorsement by natural religion would have been trifling and absurd. Without the Bible, there is little or nothing to indorse. After Jesus Christ "brought life and immortality to light," the New Testament ministry abounded in natural illustrations of this truth, the fullest example of which is seen in the fifteenth chapter of First Corinthians. But they were only illustrations, and not proofs. Bishop Butler and other writers upon the "Analogy of Nature to Religion," have unconsciously done much to weaken faith in the doctrine of a future state by substituting the evidence of natural religion for the testimony of the written revelation. Their statements, when taken as original proofs rather than mere reinforcements of Bible teaching, have been made to assume a load they are unable to bear, and are too easily refuted or checkmated by other facts in the natural world. Isaac Taylor, for example, in his "Physical Theory of a Future Life," regards the fact that the mind is able to work the body down, and compel it to rest one-third of the time, as a proof of the immateriality and immortality of the soul; but unfortunately for this argument, the same is as true of animals as of men, and would prove the immortality of the one as well as the other. Mr. Butler regards the transition of the worm to the butterfly as a good argument. But the modern Sadducee could readily suggest that every growth is capable of reaching its own limits, beyond which it can never go. A man will grow six feet and the oak two hundred, and then return to dust.

So the caterpillar is simply completing its natural development when it has obtained its wings, as man has completed his at his highest manly maturity. He might also ask, If the assumption of wings proves our immortality, what does the loss of them again prove? It is not to be admitted that God ever intended us to depend primarily upon arguments drawn from earthly material for a faith to endure the trial through which it is sure, sooner or later, to pass.

To allow the sensuist to choose the ground on which the battle is to be fought, is to agree to a drawn combat before you begin. To get down with Mr. Darwin among mollusks and radiates to settle the nature of man and the question of his immortality, is a work too absurd for God to bless. His investigations are all well enough if mere science is to be promoted; but to determine the grandest of all theological questions by comparative anatomy is a piece of intolerable stupidity. To hunt for the traces of a soul with a dissecting-knife is less sensible than to look for the tracks of magnetism in a lodestone. The Christian can experience nothing but defeat if he agrees to prove his doctrine, or even to defend it upon any such ground as this. Jesus Christ, the champion of the doctrine of immortality, chose the high plains of revelation through himself and the Holy Spirit. When the Sadducees attacked him, he did not stoop to philosophically answer their argument about the woman with the seven husbands, but introduced them to their own ignorance, both of the Scriptures and of the power of God; and constantly affirmed that he came down from heaven to bear witness to truth which "the world by wisdom" never could find out.

Paul also refused to fight the battle where the "natural man" had drawn up his forces. The natural or sensuous man, styled by the apostle the *somatikos*, or body-man, is one who depends upon his bodily senses for all his information upon all subjects, and hence rejects every thing professing to be a supernatural revelation from heaven. He held to what is now called the *positive theology*—a system of empiricism that disclaims all knowledge that does not parade itself within the range of the five senses. But Paul claimed to teach "the mysterious wisdom of God, even the hidden wisdom which God ordained before the world unto our glory—a wisdom which none of the princes of this world knew." None of them knew it; it was mysterious to them, because they depended for their



knowledge upon what "eye hath seen and ear heard." This "natural man," of course, then "received not the things of the Spirit, neither *could* he know them," because information concerning them came only by revelation. By the naked eye, one can discover only about one thousand stars in the clearest night. The millions of worlds and the thousands of universes that lie beyond unaided vision, render up their account only to the mightiest telescopes. They never walk forth seeking an introduction to the man of eyes and ears only. They allow his conceit to cherish the belief that there are only a thousand stars to be found. They can shine on and roll on, whether he ever discovers them or not. He receiveth not the things of the telescope, neither can he know them, because they are telescopically discovered; and if he prefers to cut himself off from the most that is knowable, it is his privilege to bear the consequences of his own ignorance.

Theology never committed itself to a greater absurdity than when it tried to prove from Paul's account of "the natural man" that the sinner could never understand the Gospel by his own common sense when fairly preached to him. The ordinary unconverted man, it seems, receiveth not the things of the Spirit, *neither can* he know them, because he is unconverted; whereas the apostle is discussing a very different question—that of the two sources of information men rely on—and urging that the "hidden wisdom" was attainable neither by "the eye nor the ear nor the heart of man." Neither the five senses nor human reasoning could ever fathom those depths of heaven without the aid of the eye of faith, that utilizes the telescope of Divine revelation. What eye hath not seen, "God has revealed unto us by his Spirit; for the Spirit searcheth all things, yea, even the deep things of God." The true method of argumentation with the Positivist is to reject the entire stratum of things where he operates, as containing no sufficient basis for the knowledge of spiritual entities. The naturalist who deals only in the fossils of the primary formation is unprepared to discuss all questions of comparative anatomy in the tertiary formation, and those who know nothing of man except his bones, muscles, nerves, and circulation, and reject all knowledge from the other world concerning his immortal nature and eternal relations, are wholly disqualified to discourse upon the true anthropology as it stands related

to the other side of the grave. Yet few mistakes have been more common among modern defenders of the faith than to allow the mere scientist to choose his own materialistic grounds for the battlefield, instead of demanding a higher stratum for the struggle. All honor to science, when it busies itself with questions legitimately falling within its own limits; but the attempt to lay the same lines upon the soul of man that measures material things, is an intrusion that true science should always be ashamed to own.

The common land-surveyor wishes to measure the distance across some marsh or river without traversing it, and readily accomplishes the task by fixing upon some immovable object on the other side, at which shall be formed one of the angles of his contemplated triangle. Then, by running his base-line and measuring the two other angles, he soon calculates both sides of his triangle, and determines within an inch the breadth of the impassable swamp. But if distance or a murky atmosphere should hide all objects on the other side from his view, the measurement of said distance would be as impossible as to determine the distance to a star whose parallax can not be found. Every thing depends upon his being able to see *some* object where a parallax can be formed. Just here the sensuous man, the scientist of the Positive school, must forever fail in establishing any truth in reference to a future state. He can not see across the river of death, can fix no object there, and can gain no parallax. The wisdom of this world can deal only with things of this world. Its lines are all cut off at the river. All that is beyond must be counted among the things denominated by Herbert Spencer, "the unknowable." It is utterly and irretrievably bankrupt, whenever drawn upon for information concerning "the things that are unseen." "Where is the wise man? Where is the scribe? Where is the disputer of this world? Hath not God made foolish the wisdom of this world," whenever it has "intruded itself into those things which it hath not seen vainly puffed up with its fleshly mind?" The wisdom of this world, in modern times, is no less foolishness with God than that of ancient times. Indeed, modern foolishness is no improvement upon ancient foolishness, and scarcely as respectable. A half-dozen Indians on the Western plains laid their plans to lasso the locomotive, and all the world laughed at their foolishness when they saw the undertaking caricatured in the pictorials of the day

A mud-turtle could construct a method for squaring the circle in about as much wisdom as a sensuist philosopher could set about a solution of the question of the immortality of man. What had the natural man accomplished up to the time of Paul in this direction? In Cicero's "Tusculan Disputations" may be seen his doubts and darkness, and the throes of his mighty spirit, after all the light that had been shed upon the subject by the disputers of this world for the previous five hundred years. From this world—from its data, its premises, its conclusions, its wise men, from its science or its philosophy—we have little or nothing to hope for, as shedding any light upon our state a million years to come.

The best argument outside of the Bible for man's natural immortality does not belong to science nor to any form of empiricism. It is that which says: "I have an imperishable desire to live beyond the grave, and not to suffer annihilation, the loss of friends forever, and the eternal rupture of all the holiest affections of my being. This is the greatest want of my soul, outweighing the sum total of all my other desires. All the other wants of my nature are supplied by the Creator, and it would be utterly unthinkable that this master want of the soul has been unprovided for. An animal may desire to live, but we have no evidence that he wants to live hereafter. My desire to live hereafter is dominant even over the desire to live here; and *it must be* that he has prepared something to satisfy this craving of the soul." This we admit to be a good argument; but it is founded in a soul-consciousness felt alike by the learned and the rude, and is not to be set down to the credit of sensuous science.

The fact of the existence and nature of God being ascertained, would look encouragingly in the direction of a spiritual state for man, inasmuch as if one spiritual being exists under other than human conditions, without flesh and blood, and not subject to death, it may be possible for others. But even here science fails to demonstrate the nature, if not the being, of one God. The wisdom of this world, operating under the most favorable circumstances in Egypt, Greece, and Rome, came out of the struggle, leaving the world in possession of gods many and lords many, of all sorts and sizes and genders.

We have no quarrel with science, unless it be that which is "falsely so called." On the contrary, we honor it when it stays at home and

attends to its own business. The burden of this essay is to oppose Positivism, to show that the spiritual side of our knowledge belongs to a different zone, and can be discerned only when we accept it in Divine revelation. We designed to tell of the poverty of our island home as to all means of knowing any thing definitely of heaven, to insinuate that much harm has been, and is still, being done—from Bishop Butler till this day—by directing the mind to natural religion more than to Christ and his resurrection, as the proof of immortality for man.

In this discussion we are not forgetful that there are those who believe the Bible, but interpret even it to teach no natural immortality; but that Christ in the resurrection will raise up his own to immortal life, although unconscious from death till that hour. We propose no discussion of this theory farther than to say that the promise of a resurrection itself is made in the Scriptures to depend upon the conscious, intermediate state of the dead in Christ. For example: "If Christ be not raised, then they which have fallen asleep in him have perished." That is, they have perished, *provided* Christ has *not* risen; but since he has risen, they have not perished. That this *perishing*, denied here by the apostle, means an extinction of conscious being, is plain from the response of Jesus to the Sadducees. God said: "I am the God of Abraham, of Isaac, and of Jacob. God is not the God of the dead, but of the living." This was said to Moses hundreds of years after the death of said patriarchs, who were then declared to be alive. Moreover, their conscious state is cited here by the Savior as his Scripture argument to the Sadducees "that the dead are raised up." Natural immortality was therefore taught by Christ and his apostles; and if they were qualified to speak upon the subject, the question is settled, whatever may be the failures of both science and natural religion to satisfy the soul.

We propose no discussion of the comprehensive and all-conquering evidences of the divinity of Jesus Christ in the little space left us, but ask attention to the following considerations looking in that direction:

1. If Jesus was not qualified to discourse upon the fact of a future life, no one ever was; for he is admitted by his enemies to have been "the divinest man" that ever lived. If the head teacher

can not solve the problem, who can? Are we forever to keep asking, "Where is the wise man? where is the scribe?" Are we forever to be in the dark? When ten thousand matters of trivial importance are made plain enough, is the question of questions to rest in perplexing and provoking obscurity? Has the natural man, the scientist, the sensuous man, or the Positivist, by whatever name he may be designated, ever thrown a ray of light across the dark river? Do fossils or mummies talk of immortality? Can we rely upon the testimony of the fading flower or the ephemeral butterfly? Has the most eccentric comet ever found a place it could call heaven? We can do no better than to follow the *best* authority, even if it were not completely satisfactory. But it was the specialty of Jesus to teach this doctrine—to bring "life and immortality to light." Homer was a poet, and Newton a philosopher; but Jesus was the champion of the doctrine of immortality, gave his life to its illustration and demonstration; and even from a human stand-point, is placed fairly at the head of all teachers concerning the unseen.

2. Jesus was more than man, or else a very bad man at heart. If he knew himself to be mere human while encouraging and urging belief in his divinity, he was more unprincipled than the scribes and Pharisees, whom he denounced for not believing it. Nor could he be apologized for by saying that he was honest, but self-deceived; or that he was an enthusiast: for neither he nor his work bears any marks of an enthusiast, an egotist, or a lunatic. Such men do not rule the best minds of their own time, and project themselves along the ages to come as the "divinest of men," as masters of religious thought, and models of every virtue. He was so thoroughly master of himself, of his subject, and of his opponents, that he was never caught unprepared for any emergency, for any question, or any argument. He never was in doubt upon any subject, and never hesitated in giving an answer. In brief, the world has furnished no man so well possessed of himself, so free from idiosyncrasies, and so little liable to the charge of enthusiasm or any other one-sidedness of character. This leaves the remark eminently true that he was either more than man, or a very mean, unprincipled demagogue; an assertion that no man would hazard who cares anything for his own reputation among people of common intelligence.

3. Although the broadest and profoundest mind that ever thought

out all human relations and obligations, and projected principles of action suited to all ages, Jesus appears before the people with a specialty,—*to convince men of a future life, and to prepare them for it.* He never attempted to write a better poem than the "Iliad," to excel Thucydides as an historian, or Pericles as an orator. He never vied with statesmen in politics, with the seven wise men in apothegms, or even with Socrates in morals. Although, incidentally, he did reveal more true poetry, history, oratory, and moral principles than any and all these, he accomplished it more because he could not avoid it in the mighty sweep of his life, than by any direct effort to excel. God sends the bird to roost by the revolution of the earth upon its axis; yet this was not his prime object in revolving it: so Jesus incidentally improves the politics of a nation, while moving them to secure a "citizenship in heaven."

4. In assuring us of the reality of another life, he adopts his own methods—radical, thorough, and unique. He first crosses the ether sea himself, and thereby announces that "the dayspring from on high has visited us." He comes with credentials indisputable from the upper court, of which we can not now speak particularly. His appearance here from afar, not only proves the existence of another kingdom, but it throws a cord across the chasm to reunite these severed worlds. Having completely identified himself with our nature, and suffered our experience down to the last sorrow, he recrossed the chasm with his glorified humanity, to give this world the assurance of a representative in heaven. Thus divinity was clothed with humanity, that humanity might be clothed with divinity; and while we have a representative perpetually in the upper kingdom, Jesus sends his Holy Spirit into the hearts of his children, here to abide with them in his absence, as a reminder of heaven and as a buoy to bear their souls above the troubled wave. This is another chord thrown over the distance, and, having secured itself in our hearts, doubles itself again by "setting our affections on things above, and not on things on the earth." Then comes the happy assurance, that all the trains and chariots of God are filled with emigrants from this world to that, and that, in due time, all our pure in heart shall be safely colonized at God's right-hand. Thus shall many a strand be thrown across, and a causeway built to God, until solid ground shall invite our feet to heaven; and "then there shall be no more sea."



Whether the Positivist accepts this doctrine of Jesus or not, he is compelled to respect the methods by which the attempt is made to convince the world of a future life, and to prepare them for it. Jesus speaks to the people with such a just commingling of the subjective and the objective, the human and divine, the natural and the spiritual, as to bring the powers of the two worlds to bear upon the soul, to win it home to God. He handles such themes, and in such a style, that the people are not bewildered with metaphysical terms and forms of thought suited only to wranglers in the forums of Greece. Nor does he spend his time amid ovaries, ova, cells, protoplasms, or other objects of thought, that, however true, have no salvation in them. But the great facts of life and death, responsibility, future existence, and the way to obtain the rest that remains to the people of God, were the staple of all he thought and said while here among men.

The sensuous philosophy embraces in its advocacy both materialists and deists. As deists and believers in the immortality of man, they should look well to their proofs of immortality while rejecting the Divinity of Jesus. If he can not be relied on as a teacher sent from God, what proof have they of such a proposition in view of the impotency of science, human wisdom, and the unsatisfactory evidence of even natural religion? Let them parade their butterflies, vernal flowers, and such like premises, and submit them to ordinary powers of analysis, and see if they will argue eternal life for man. We can allow them the use of Butler's Analogy and of the works of all his commentators till this hour, and challenge them to give a *good* reason for the hope of a hereafter. God never intended our faith in this truth to be sustained independently of revelation, and those Christian writers who have unconsciously shifted the faith of the people from the Bible to natural religion as a foundation, are weakening public confidence in a future life, as their inconclusive arguments, one after another, are overturned. No conviction needs a surer place in the public mind to-day more than that those who believe in immortality but reject Jesus and the Bible, are wholly unable to prove what they believe while discrediting the only witnesses competent to testify in the case.

The true province of human reasoning as to the claims of Christianity, is to examine the evidences of its Divine origin. If they be not satisfactory, lay no claim to any truth it advocates concerning

which you have evidence from no other source. No man should seize upon its jewels and claim them as his own, when, at the same time, he must depend upon the evidences of Christianity to prove that they are jewels. No doubter should affirm his belief in any of these eternal verities, unless he can prove them without the aid of the Bible and its author; and, as "that which is of the earth is earthy," we assume that it can never testify to that which is heavenly.

But if the evidence of the divinity of Christ and the divine character of the Bible seem sufficient, it stops all controversy on the subject of immortality, whatever doubts may arise from the earthy side of our nature. It settles also, at once, many other questions; such as the canonicity of each of the books of the Old Testament. If Jesus was divine, his indorsement of "the Law, the Prophets, and the Psalms," or any single book, ends all dispute. Also, what is called "the prayer test" is settled instantly when we accept Jesus as a "teacher come from God." He says God answers prayer; and there the controversy must end with every true believer. If Mr. Tyndall had not been thinking, as most specialists do, in a fragmentary manner, he would have seen that the empiricism of his test would be an insult to God, as it would only be a scheme to try whether his Word, that promises answer to prayer, was true. "Thou shalt not put the Lord thy God to the proof." "Ask, and you shall receive" any thing that a wise parent sees ought to be granted to a child; but any thing shall be withheld that ought to be, even life itself.

From all that is before us, the divinity of Jesus Christ is the locomotive question of the day. Faith in him draws every other question to the arbitrament of his Word; and it is not a little strange that the people called "Christians," or "Disciples," for the last fifty years have been, in every possible way, emphasizing this thought without themselves seeing the full value of it. In taking the confession of a penitent precedent to baptism, they would tolerate no other question but, "Do you believe with all your heart that Jesus is the Christ the Son of the living God, and your Savior?" They have also, singularly enough, insisted that the Christian's creed has but one article in it—that *Jesus is the Christ*—and have given the Lord's-supper, by its weekly observance, and consequently the Lord's death for our sins, a strange prominence before all the world

And although, like the prophets, they little understood all that the truths they were disseminating "did signify," their value is becoming more and more evident, as believers of other names are daily swelling the throng that cry: "Hosanna to the King of Israel; blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord!" "He is the blessed and only potentate, King of kings and Lord of lords; who only hath immortality, dwelling in the light which no man can approach unto; whom no man hath seen, nor can see: to whom be power and honor everlasting. Amen."

One of the most astonishing experiences of a redeemed spirit may be to realize in heaven that it once debated the question of its own immortality, and found the scales to turn but little in its favor. So interlaced with flesh and blood, and so far from home, it asserted itself but feebly amid the clamor of animal passions. "The flesh lusting against the spirit, and the spirit against the flesh, and these contrary one to the other, it could not do that which it would." But it grew in grace and knowledge, and began to be victorious. The outward man began to perish, and the inward man to be renewed day by day, until it could appropriate the sacred pledge:

"And thou shalt walk, in soft, white light, with kings and priests abroad;  
And thou shalt summer high in bliss upon the hills of God."

## III.—INSPIRATION.

*VI Prolegomenon to the Gospels.* By HENRY ALFORD.

*Nature and the Supernatural.* By HORACE BUSHNELL.

*Inspiration.* By H. W. BEECHER, (*Christian Union*, June 11.)

“WHAT advantage, then, hath the Jew?” cries the great Apostle of the Gentiles, and replies: “Much every way; first, indeed, that they were intrusted with the oracles of God.” This unspeakable privilege he confirms in writing to Timothy (2 Tim. iii, 14): “But abide *thou* in the things which thou didst learn, and wast assured of, knowing from whom thou didst learn, and that from a child thou knowest the Holy Scriptures, which are able to make thee wise unto salvation, through faith which is in Christ Jesus. All Scripture is God-breathed, and is profitable for teaching, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, that the man of God may be complete, thoroughly furnished for every good work.”

In insisting on the infinite value of the words of God, Paul was walking in the steps of his Lord. “Search the Scriptures,” said Christ to the Jews; “for in them ye think ye have eternal life; and they are they which testify of me.” In thinking they had eternal life in their Scriptures, the Jews were not mistaken, otherwise Christ would not have told them to “*search them*,” and if the Jews, as a nation, failed to obtain eternal life, it was because they did not so search their Scriptures as to find Christ; but, listening to their blind guides who babbled about a Messiah whom they were rejecting, cried “crucify him,” with their Scriptures in their hands.

And yet they had an enthusiastic pride in their Scriptures. They valued them “more than gold, yea, much fine gold.” Men were continually employed transcribing the “sacred letters;” and when some scribe, happier than his brethren, succeeded in making a copy without one mistake, the precious parchment was almost worshiped. It was enshrined in gold, but seldom even looked on, and always handled with awe. Yet they missed salvation after all, because they understood not what they all but adored.

They did not so "search" as to find *Him* of whom their Scriptures testified.

In all his discourses our Lord always appealed to the Scriptures as of supreme authority; and when thrice assailed by Satan in the wilderness, thrice repelled his assault by the sword of the Spirit. "*It is written; it is written; it is written.*"

Of course, the apostles in this followed their Master. Paul, as we just noticed, reminds Timothy of his blessed privilege in being taught the Old Testament Scriptures from his childhood, and informs him that the New Testament writings, which were then being added to the Old, were equally authoritative and profitable, necessary and infallible.

The testimony of Peter on the subject of Inspiration is twofold, and is perfectly explicit and conclusive. He first indorses the Epistles of Paul as part of the "Scriptures," notwithstanding "the hard things" they contained, which the "unlearned and unstable wrest to their own destruction, as they do the other Scriptures." (2 Peter iii, 16.) And in the first chapter of the same Epistle, verse 21, he declares concerning the prophecies of the Old Testament, that they did not come by "the will of man;" but, "moved by the Holy Spirit, men spake from God." I quote from the version of the Bible Union, which is made from the most approved text.

What Peter asserts of the prophecy of the Old Testament, of course is equally true of all the other portions of the older revelation. "Men *moved* [literally *borne along* like ships before a breeze], spake from God." The will of the men had nothing to do with the words which their pens recorded. They were merely the amanuenses of the Holy Spirit. "They spake from God." And yet it is true—and an interesting truth—that each earthen vessel gives its own flavor to the living water. It is demonstrable, therefore, that both Christ and his apostles held the words of Scripture to be words of God. When Jesus told Satan, "It is written," he meant it was so written in the Book of God; or, that the words he quoted, "Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word of God," were the very words penned by Moses, and spoken by God. So the apostles always quote the very words of the Old Testament as the infallible words of God, and therefore as an end of all debate.

It is an awful proof how far (what is called) the religious world

has swerved from the doctrine of Christ and his apostle, when the popular fancy on Inspiration is, that the words of the Bible are *not* the words of God. This is condemned under the name of "verbal inspiration," as something altogether unreasonable. Dean Alford, in his sixth "Prolegomenon to the Gospels," argues at great length against such "plenary" inspiration, and is at no pains to conceal his contempt for the ignorance of its advocates. It is, however, a more than suspicious fact, that the dean never once allows either Christ or his apostle to be heard on the subject. Quenching, as he daringly does, the light of *their* testimony, it is very plain the dean is fighting in the dark. No wonder if he hurts himself more than his antagonists. Strange that a man so learned, and otherwise so estimable, should have supposed it possible to snatch a snap judgment, while the great, decisive witnesses, whose testimony would have silenced him forever, or compelled him to make a humble confession of most inexcusable ignorance, were never allowed to open their mouths.

The very same is true of Dr. Horace Bushnell. He can hardly keep grave while rejecting the doctrine that the *words* of Scripture are God's words, and therefore infallible; but he takes good care never to allow Christ or his apostles to be heard on the subject. He finds the plenary inspiration so "impracticable," that, after enumerating what he supposes the impossibilities of the doctrine, he calmly, or rather contemptuously, flings it aside. This is precisely the process of all the infidels regarding the Bible as a whole. They say it is full of impossibilities, only fit for fools.

As to Mr. H. W. Beecher, he does not seem to know or care any thing about *plenary* inspiration. He claims it, in general, for all "the true children of God;" and, of course, by implication, for himself! In going over the main things alleged by these eminent authors, Dean Alford will claim our principal attention, not only on account of his superior learning, but also because he argues at much greater length than either of the others; or, at all events, seems to argue: for really, when the great facts, for whatever reason, are never allowed to be heard, it is plain the argument can not amount to much.

Now, it is well, on entering the discussion, to remember two things: First, that Christ appointed the apostles as his witnesses to the world; and, second, that he expressly promised to send them the Holy Spirit, to bring all things, to their remembrance, and thus



perfectly to qualify them for their high functions. The questions, then, are very simple, connected with these two facts. Did our Lord perform his promise? Did the apostles report truly and accurately the doings and sayings of their Lord? If he did not send the Holy Spirit as their infallible Remembrancer, his promise failed; or if the apostles really enjoyed 'such infallible guidance, and yet came short in their testimony, then *they* failed. A due respect for our Lord and his apostles forbids either supposition.

This seems very plain; and no doubt the piety of Alford would have been glad to agree to it, had it not been for some awkward difficulties that seemed to beset the truth. This impatience and intolerance of difficulties, however, may be rather inconsiderate. What subject, sacred or secular, is free from difficulties? The science of quantity, or mathematics, is usually regarded as most certain in its principles and free from all difficulties, and yet who that has even a moderate acquaintance with it, is ignorant that there are puzzles in it that bewilder our faculties? These perplexities, however, do not at all embarrass the astronomer, the accountant, the land-measurer. They may make us smile, and should teach us humility; but they are, *practically*, of no account. The case is the same in chemistry, physiology, and, indeed, in every science.

If, then, the truths of mathematics, and the facts and principles of science, are hard to be harmonized, why must the facts of God's Word and of the operations of his Spirit be cavilled at or denied, because we feel some difficulty in perceiving how they hang together? But what are the dean's difficulties that seem to try his temper so severely, and to make him so harsh to his brethren, who believe the Bible to be really the Word of God? A leading one respects the inscription on the cross. It is reported in four different ways by the four evangelists. How then can they be *verbally inspired*?

Matthew gives it: "This is Jesus, the king of the Jews."

Mark gives it: "The king of the Jews."

Luke gives it: "The king of the Jews, this (man)."

John gives it: "Jesus, the Nazarene, the king of the Jews."

Well, in one thing they are all harmonious. With one mouth they all proclaim HIM *the king of the Jews*; and, in passing, I will just say, it were well if those calling themselves Christians would meditate, more than perhaps they do, the significance and

vast importance of that title. As to reconciling the variety of the inscriptions with the fact that each was furnished by the Holy Spirit, I would suggest: Suppose the inscription that was actually written by Pilate was, "*This is Jesus, the Nazarene, the king of the Jews.*" What then? The dean will reply: Then not one of them tells the truth. The essential truth was, that Jesus is the king of the Jews; and that truth each one proclaims. The fact is, not one of them states the *whole* truth, and not one of them undertook to state the *whole* truth. What each one states *is* truth, and it is only by putting all their statements together, that the whole truth is found out. But, then, the dean's disciples will persist in their demand: If every evangelist got his words from the Holy Spirit, why does every inscription differ from another? A fair question; and, perhaps, our answer may throw some light on a subject of some difficulty.

I would say, then, "There are diversities of gifts, but the same Spirit;" "But to each is given the manifestation of the Spirit for profit." (1 Cor. xii, 4, 7.) Now, the profit in this diversity of manifestation in the four evangelists, I take to be this: While historic truth required the statements of the evangelists to be harmonious, historic propriety, and indeed necessity, demanded that they should be different. Four impostors would have taken good care to make their inscriptions identical, and would thereby have betrayed collusion and fraud. When and where, from the beginning of the world, since courts were set up on earth, did four independent, *honest* witnesses give their testimonies in exactly the same words? Never was such a thing known, and never will be known.

Now, if the Divine Wisdom thought fit to give us four witnesses, and if these witnesses were honest and independent, it was impossible their testimony should be identical. Had they all said the same thing in the same words, they would have condemned themselves; their evidence would have been worthless. The problem which the Spirit had to solve was to give us four independent accounts, all necessarily different, and yet all absolutely harmonious; and the problem has been solved, as the inscription on the cross demonstrates, so far as it goes.

But, then, Alford insists, so far from the accounts being absolutely harmonious on the great fact of the resurrection, "*they are variously set forth in detail, with many minor discrepancies.*" Precisely

so; the accounts must necessarily be so, if they are honest. The question is, Are the "discrepancies" contradictions? The dean does not say so; and yet unless he means this, he speaks impertinently. Certainly, a discrepancy is not necessarily, nor properly, a contradiction. The resurrection history has always been a favorite field for the shallow infidel. Every one knows how that confident and clever young gentleman, Mr. West, was sure he had detected the evangelists in mutual contradictions on that fundamental fact, and undertook with his friend, Lord Lyttleton, to overthrow Christianity by demonstrating the impossibilities of the Gospel narrative, while his lordship was to do his part in the great destructive demonstration by proving the contradictions in the three accounts of Paul's conversion.

What was the result of this bold conspiracy for the disgrace of Christ and his cause? Both the young gentlemen became earnest believers. If a hundred honest infidels anywhere were to make the same experiment, I do not believe one of them would remain an infidel. The great trouble is, that so very few men, young or old, read the Bible in that way; and the deadly fact is, that infidels—almost to a man, it is to be feared—are in love with sin, and therefore do not wish the Bible to be true; and, as a consequence, they do not generally read the Bible. "They love the darkness rather than the light, because their deeds are evil." Gausson has given an elaborate harmony of the evangelical accounts of the resurrection. He was a foeman in every respect worthy of Alford's steel, who should either have answered the illustrious Swiss, or written with more temper and consideration. In his second and third paragraphs, Alford writes thus:

*"In what sense are the evangelists to be regarded as having been inspired by the Holy Spirit of God? . . . Because they are regarded as authentic documents, descending from the apostolic age, and presenting to us the substance of the apostolic testimony."*

These are the dean's italics; and, if I mistake not, the emphasis is entirely thrown away. For the apostolic testimony was extremely simple, embracing but the two grand facts of the atoning death and the justifying resurrection of our Lord. Now, we have at least one undoubted letter descending from the apostolic age. I mean the letter of Clement of Rome to the Church of Corinth. This is the Clement whose name is in the Book of Life, the friend of our apostle.

Now, supposing this precious and long letter of the apostolic age to contain the substance of the apostolic testimony, as it can hardly fail to do, the question is, Would Alford regard the letter as inspired? Certainly he would not; and yet it has all the characteristics of inspiration contained above, in his answer. This seems to prove that the dean wrote too hastily on this great subject.

Notwithstanding our author's zeal against *verbal* inspiration, he seems nearly to admit, substantially, all that the truth implies. In paragraph 8, we are referred to our Lord's promise to his apostles (John xiv, 26): "The Holy Spirit whom the Father will send in my name, he will teach you all things, and will remind you of all things which I said to you." Now, it is of this promise of which Alford says, "If we look to our present Gospels, we see abundant evidence of its fulfillment." If so, then we have all the words of our Lord faithfully and infallibly reported to us. What is this but *verbal* inspiration? The words of Christ form the very backbone and marrow of the Gospels. If we have these, *all* these, what more do we need? But moreover, we find the dean, in paragraph 9, asking: "Can we suppose that the light poured by the Holy Spirit upon the *sayings* of our Lord would be confined to such sayings, and not extend itself over the other parts of the narrative of his life on earth?" "Can we believe that those miracles, which, though not uttered in words, were yet *acted parables*, would not be under the same gracious assistance, brought back to the minds of the apostles, so that they should be placed on record for the teaching of the Church?" In paragraph 10, the dean goes on to indorse all that is related beyond the cycle of the apostle's own testimony, such as the first chapter of Luke, etc. Well, if we have all this in the infallible words of the Holy Spirit, what is wanting? Are not the entire Gospels, by the dean's own admissions, conveyed to us in the very words of the Holy Spirit? What, then, is the trouble?

It seems the evangelists do not relate events in the same order. Matthew and Luke arrange the incidents of the temptation differently. And what has that to do with *verbal* inspiration? Do not the facts and *words* agree? The same objection is taken to the position of the calling of Matthew in the Gospel narrative, etc. And what is all that to the question, whether in the evangelical history we have the *words* of the Holy Spirit?

Alford's concluding paragraphs of his "VI Prolegomenon" seem to contradict, in a way somewhat astounding, his previous admissions concerning the words and miracles of Christ. For example, in paragraph 19: "Another objection to the theory is, that if it be so, the Christian world is left in uncertainty what her [*its* ?] Scriptures are, as long as the sacred text is full of various readings." The word "theory" is abused when applied to the fact that the apostles got their words from the Holy Spirit. That *fact*, Alford has distinctly and substantially admitted. He holds that Christ's promise was fully performed of sending the Holy Spirit to bring to their minds *all the things he had said to them*. Could he do this without reminding them of his *words*? But to what purpose if, in his Divine providence, he allowed the blunders of transcribers to throw his sayings into a chaos of "various readings?"

There seems to be great confusion of thought in the strange allegation that "the sacred text is full of various readings." This confounds the different manuscripts with the "sacred text." Alford's great life-labor was, by a comparison of these manuscripts, to bring out a harmonious "sacred text." The outcome of his toils he presents us in his critical text. It is singular to tell us, after all, that the "sacred text" "is left in uncertainty." I had thought that the advantage of the different manuscripts, which gave us all those various readings, was, that they enabled us, by a careful comparison, to find out the true reading, and thus to form a better text than any single manuscript contained. So far from the various readings throwing us into uncertainty, they are the means which Providence has preserved to destroy uncertainty. If, in any case, the manuscripts are so nicely balanced that it is impossible to tell which reading is preferable, the word, in that case, of course, must be uncertain. But such a balance is, and must be, extremely rare. In such a case, it is of course impossible to say which is the inspired word. But shall such a rare case throw doubt over the whole text? The simple truth is, it is of no practical importance.

But then we are assured that, "to the latest age, the reading of some important passages will be matter of doubt in the Church." "Some?" How many? "Important?" Why not tell us what the passages, that we may judge for ourselves of their importance? But suppose the case to be just so, what then? Shall we therefore deny that our Lord always quotes the Scripture as the words of God? Shall

we therefore forget that three strokes of that "sword of the Spirit," which is the Word of God, silenced Satan, and drove him into darkness? Is it doubtful that Paul assures Timothy that "*all Scripture is God-breathed?*" And what can this mean except that the words of Scripture are the words of God? Both Christ and his apostles, Paul and Peter, speak of the volume that lay in all the synagogues of the world, as the sure word of God. That volume still lies, substantially unchanged, in all the synagogues now on earth, and that volume is identical with that which we hold in our Hebrew Bibles. Peter pronounced Paul's letters "Scripture;" and declares that "prophecy was never brought by the will of man; but, *borne on by the Holy Spirit, men spake from God.*" Were their words, then, not the words at once of the Holy Spirit and of God?

Willfully ignorant of such texts and facts, no wonder Alford is harassed with perplexities, and can not write two consistent paragraphs on the subject. As I said, he is fighting in darkness that he has created by putting out the great lights of Christ and his apostles; and no wonder, and little pity, if he is wounding himself all the time.

Paragraph 21: "If I understand *plenary inspiration* rightly, I hold it to the utmost." Indeed! How do you hold it, when you are denying all the time that inspiration has given us the words of the Holy Spirit? If he has not given us his words, what *has* he given us? It is plain, so far from "understanding *plenary inspiration* rightly," you deny it altogether.

"The inspiration of the sacred writers I believe to have consisted in the fullness of the influence of the Holy Spirit, specially raising them to, and fitting them for, thier work, *in a manner which distinguishes them from all writers, and their work from all other work.*" This is saying nothing to the purpose. It is too vague and general, and determines nothing. The work of the apostles was to write a book. If "the fullness of the influence of the Holy Spirit" distinguished the apostles from all other writers, how were they distinguished, if not by having words given them which were never given to any other writers; thus enabling them to pen a work essentially, because *divinely*, superior to all other works? It would be a very curious "fullness of influence" which denied them a single word. "The men were full of the Holy Ghost;" and yet, it seems, not one of their words was from



him! "The books are the pouring out of that fullness." Indeed! Then, surely, the words which make up the books must be the pouring out of the Holy Spirit. Or must we believe the books to be the Holy Spirit's, and not the words?

Will one of the numerous disciples of the dean condescend to enlighten the darkness of us poor creatures, who, the dean declares, have never undertaken the intelligent study of the Scripture ourselves?

"The treasure is ours, in all its richness." Where is the richness if, in the Gospels, we have merely the words of a poor fisherman, a physician, a tax-gatherer, and the nephew of Barnabas? "But it [the treasure] is ours, as only it can be ours, in the imperfection of human speech." "*Imperfection!*" Have we not the words of Christ? Did he not promise to bring *all* that he said to the apostles back to their minds by the gift of the Holy Spirit? Does not the dean declare that the promise was fully performed? How, then, dare he talk of the "imperfection of the treasure?" No doubt the words of Christ were "*human*," for he is man; but they are also divine, for he is God. It is blind ignorance, if not impiety, to talk of "*imperfection*." "The treasure is ours in the limitation of human thought." That "limitation" is no imperfection; on the contrary, it is perfection, because it is thus perfectly suited to a limited being like man. But the very limitation is divine, because it is from God. It is ours in the variety incident at first to individual character." That "variety" implies no imperfection; nay, it is one of the divine excellencies of the Bible that it unites the energy of Peter, the simplicity, the love, the indignation of John, and the learning, the depth, the terrible denunciation, the melting tenderness, the Christ-like humility, the unrivaled gush of eloquence, of our own apostle. The maker of the men made them very different; and hence the variety of their style. But that very variety is one of the divine beauties of the Scriptures; and fits them for their varied adaptation to us all. Not one of them speaks words taught by his own wisdom (1 Cor. ii, 13); but words taught by the Holy Spirit.

Alford's last alleged drawback on the "treasure" is, that it comes to us by "manifold transcription and the lapse of ages." He had already insisted on this, and we noticed it. Recurring to it again, does not help his argument. It rather shows a paucity and poverty of proof, that savor of a weak cause. However, we will give it one

word more. Well, did not the old Testament come into Christ's hands by "manifold transcription and the lapse of ages?" And yet he quotes Moses, David, and Isaiah, as if they were still "living and abiding." And so they were; for, as the dean tells us in his own translation (1 Peter i, 23), "The Word of God liveth and abideth." And, surely, if such was the immortality of the Old Testament, he would not pretend, were he still here, that the New was "waxing old, and ready to vanish away."

Paragraph 22: "Two things I would earnestly impress on my readers: First, that we must take our views of inspiration, not, as is too often done, from *a priori* considerations; but entirely from the evidence furnished by the Scriptures themselves." It is plain, however, from all that we have said, that this is just what Alford will not do. The evidence furnished by Christ and his apostles, Paul and Peter, he never once refers to; nay, he tampers with Paul's words (2 Tim. iii, 16,) so as to blunt the sharp edge of the sword of the Spirit, translating thus: "All Scripture inspired by God is profitable," etc.; leaving it open to cavil what *is* "inspired by God." An infidel would not object to such Scripture as the dean gives us. He would say, Certainly, *if* any writing *is* inspired by God, it must be "profitable;" but you must prove its inspiration. Paul leaves no room for such quibbling. What he says is: "All Scripture [all the sacred writings, *hiera grammata*, of which he had spoken in verse 15, and of which he continues to speak] is God-breathed."

Peter's noted declaration (Second Epistle i, 21) is also changed, certainly not for the better, in Alford's version. He translates thus: "Men had utterance from God, being moved by the Holy Spirit." Even as he gives it, the text is fatal to his doctrine. For if the sacred penmen had "utterance from God, being moved by the Holy Spirit," what they *uttered*, that is their *words*, came from the operation of the Holy Spirit. But why talk of "utterance" instead of speech? The plain common meaning of *laleo* is, *I speak*; not, *I utter*.

The dean's second "thing" is: that THE MEN WERE INSPIRED, the BOOKS ARE THE RESULTS OF THAT INSPIRATION. This latter consideration, if all that it implies be duly weighed, will furnish us with the key to the whole question. And so he wraps it up. Not another word does he utter. In truth, he seems heartily sick of the whole matter; and no wonder. For what does he mean by "THE

MEN BEING INSPIRED?" Were the words that they wrote really *God's* words; that is, as Paul says, *God-breathed*?—words taught not by man's wisdom, but taught by the Spirit? (1 Cor. ii, 13.) No: Alford denies that their words were God's words. Then how could they (the writers) be "*inspired*?" What good did such inspiration do them, or us, if, after all, it did not furnish them one word infallible and divine?

"The BOOKS are the RESULTS OF THAT INSPIRATION." Most extraordinary books, indeed! *All inspired, but not containing one word from God!* "This last consideration" we have earnestly endeavored "duly to weigh," and, instead of furnishing a key, it seems to lock the whole subject up in Egyptian darkness. So must it ever be when, instead of allowing God's lamp to guide us, we put it out, and then go groping among sparks of our own.

The most extraordinary of all Alford's assertions I have reserved for a parting remark. It meets us at the close of paragraph 19, and is in these words: "There is hardly a sentence in the whole of the Gospels, in which there are not varieties of diction in our principal manuscripts, baffling attempts to decide which was its original form." Let us try to test this a little. Here are *three* sentences spoken by our Lord to Nicodemus (John iii, 14, 15, 16): "And as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of man be lifted; that whosoever believeth on him should not perish, but have eternal life. For God so loved the world as to give his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on him should not perish, but have eternal life." Of all the words of God and Christ, none surpass these in their infinite importance, their eternal weight and value, to every human being. How, then, stands the fact regarding "their diction in our principal manuscripts?" I can not here compare these manuscripts, for I have them not; but on examining the texts of Alford and T. S. Green, I find them the same to a letter and an accent. Is their "*diction*," then, not identical? The three texts of Erasmus, Mill, and Tittman by Hahn, and E. Robinson, agree with these in every monosyllable except one, and that makes not the smallest difference in the sense in any English version. Indeed, the difference in the Greek is absolutely nothing, practically, inasmuch as the two propositions, *en* and *eis*, can not there be distinguished, both meaning the same English *IN*. What, then, does such a variety in *diction*

amount to? Just nothing at all. Why, then, does the dean parade his manuscript learning to puzzle so simple a matter? It seems he needed every thing, or *nothing*, to make a case against the sticklers for verbal inspiration.

Let us take twelve sentences instead of three; namely, the twelve first verses of John ii. There, the texts above referred to do not differ by one syllable from each other. Alford puts in one letter, which is not found in the rest, and makes not a particle's difference in the sense. It is just the same in Greek as *h* in English before a vowel. That letter, the two languages insert before a vowel for the sake of the sound simply. This example, therefore, is more striking than even the last, and is especially valuable as showing what the tens of thousands of various readings amount to, which probably are of no account once in a hundred times. Now, no man knew this better than the late Dean of Canterbury; and I am pained that a man to whom sacred letters are so much indebted as they are to him, should have been tempted to such deplorable inconsistency by the difficulties of the position which he had so unnecessarily taken. We should be sorry to accuse Dean Alford of any disingenuousness. He was misled into his untenable position by a fear of giving an advantage to the infidel by claiming Divine authority for every word of the Canon, not taking time to reflect that his fear betrayed him into the very danger he wished to avoid. More patient reflection might have convinced him that any word which a conflict of manuscripts rendered doubtful could not impair the authority of the thousands of words about which there was no conflict. These, forming the substance of the Divine message, would still make a book justly and substantially claiming the authority of Heaven.

II. Let us now turn to consider, for a little, the views of Dr. Horace Bushnell on Inspiration. So far as argument (if such it may be called) is concerned, he is merely a re-echo of the Dean of Canterbury; and yet there is such a garnishing of fiction in "Nature and the Supernatural," that its author is no doubt a candidate for the honors of originality. He denies that either angel or man remains in the state in which God created him. There is a stern fatality on each *created* spirit of falling at once into apostasy, in order to pass into a permanent condition of virtue; a fatality, however, which the

doctor does not say belongs to the Creator. But, though impeccable himself, it seems he can not create an unsinning angel; because, though created holy, it is unavoidable for him (the angel) to prove his free-will, by at once choosing to do wrong. If, however, no angel or man could be free without immediately falling into sin, we naturally ask how God himself can be free without passing through the same dread ordeal. Bushnell's theory seems to make no provision for the eternal glory of the Creator. But it is surely very strange that our Maker (blessed be his name!) should be able to maintain his own glorious, unchangeable holiness forever, and yet not be able to communicate his own virtue to his creature. If such created virtue would be inconsistent with the creature's free-will, how can God have the glory of an excellence which can never fall? If he *must* be good, where is his merit? where is his moral freedom?

But, though our theorist denies the possibility of an unfallen angel, he denies, at the same time, the existence of Satan, believing only in a vast chaos of demons. I say chaos; for if the demons have no leader, they can hardly form a confederacy.

Now, it would be strange, indeed, if a brain conceiving such a medley as this, could hold, at the same time, the perfection of the Bible. Bushnell finds an infallible Scripture "impracticable;" and no wonder. But he, so far, deserves credit for his candor; for when we see how every dreamer is palming his nonsense on the Bible, so that avowed infidels laugh at it, as a nose of wax which any fool can twist into any shape he pleases, Dr. Bushnell has, at least, the glory of not fathering his fancies on the Bible as God and his prophets *have given* it.

But let us listen to the doctor himself, page 33:

"But while I am looking with interest to the emboldening of faith, in the great truths of holy experience, I have a particular looking in my argument toward the authentication of the Christian Scriptures, in a way that avoids the inherent difficulties of the question of a punctually infallible and verbal inspiration. These difficulties, I feel constrained to admit, are insuperable."

How "insuperable?" Grant that one word may be doubtful in the Sermon on the Mount—some monosyllable that hardly affects the sense one way or another—shall we allow such a trifle to tempt us to fling away all the words of Him who speaks as never man spake?

That, surely, would be "straining out the gnat and swallowing the camel." That, surely, would be a strange way of "authenticating" the Sermon on the Mount. Suppose the word is more than doubtful; let it be a clear blunder of a transcriber,—where is the absurdity of throwing it away, and holding all the rest? But in that case, retorts the doctor, *verbal* inspiration is given up. I reply, Certainly, the inspiration of *that* one word which you have shown to be *uninspired*. But in destroying the Divine authority of *that* word, you have "*authenticated*" all the rest. These we will continue to hold with greater assurance than we did before your "authentication." "Prove all things, and hold fast that which is good." "The words of the Lord are pure words, like silver purified in a furnace of earth seven times." Your furnace, it seems, has brought out a bit of dross. Fling it away, and hold all the silver, the precious silver, that remains.

The doctor, like the dean, insists on an infallible manuscript, if we are to hold an infallible Bible. We are satisfied in this, as in every thing else, to follow the example of our Lord and his apostles. We are told when Jesus went into the synagogue of Nazareth, there was handed to him the book of the prophet Isaiah. He opened it, and began to proclaim "the acceptable year of the Lord." A Sadducee might have caviled at some word of the book, and said, If that word is doubtful, how can we know that any one is sound? Christ, however, reads and expounds as if every word was divine. He told his hearers "to search the Scriptures," not to find out spurious words, for he implies there were none, but to find "eternal life," by finding himself. There was no danger of finding any falsehood there. His testimony would not allow it. Paul, too, tells the Corinthians (First Epistle ii, 13) that he spoke words taught by the Holy Spirit; and, certainly, if he spoke such words, he also wrote them. He assures Timothy, as we insisted before, that *all* Scripture was "God-breathed," and, as such, profitable for teaching, which it could not well be if erroneous. If Dr. Bushnell can prove that God did not speak some particular word, he would show *it* was not breathed by God, and therefore not Scripture. By taking *it* away, he would only make the book perfect. But this he, nor Alford, nor any one, has ever done to the Old Testament; and it never will be done.

The doctor may, no doubt, reply, The thing has been done with the New; 1 John, v, 7, has been detected as an interpolation,



and expelled from the text. Certainly, and properly expelled when detected as an interpolation. Prove another interpolation, and we will expel that too. But we object to expulsion without proof; and we, above all, protest against making interpolation a reason for tainting with suspicion the whole word of God. "After all the words, syllables, iotas, of the book are coming into question, the infallibility is logically at an end. The moment we begin to ask, What manuscript shall we follow? what words and numerals correct? what interpolations extirpate? we have possibly a large work on hand; and where is the limit? Shall we stop short of giving up 1 John v, 7? or shall we go a large stride beyond, and give up the first chapters of Matthew and Luke?" It is clear, Bushnell is not satisfied with extirpating 1 John 5, 7. He insists, as that has been proved not infallible, the infallibility of the whole book is gone. On the contrary, I maintain, the infallibility of every other verse is confirmed. Why is that one verse cast out? Because, from its absence in the best manuscripts, we have good reason for believing John never wrote it. But the presence of all the other verses in the best manuscripts proves them to be the words of John, who had his words from the Holy Spirit, according to Christ's promise. The infallibility of these is not affected by the extirpation of the fallible. Nay, then; for if the absence of the one verse from the best manuscripts was a valid reason for casting it out, the presence of all the other verses in the same manuscripts must be a reason equally valid for keeping them in. Our brilliant brother talks a great deal about logic. Where is his logic in treating the spurious and the genuine in precisely the same way? For it will not do for him to tell us that he does not deny the other verses, but limits his denial to the proved interpolation; for he eagerly seizes the surrender of the one verse as reason for rejecting, or at all events for doubting, all the rest. If you reject this, why not reject all? Nay, he makes this admission the ground of asking us to go a great way farther: "Or shall we go a large stride beyond, and give up the first chapters of Matthew and Luke?" So, then, he is not satisfied with the giving up of the one verse; but makes it the ground of an attack on whole chapters. He wants "to go a large stride;" but we refuse to go an inch, without a reason. There was a good reason for not stopping short of giving up 1 John v, 7; but there is no reason at all, at least he gives none, for either "going" a long stride or a short one *beyond*.

"We are also obliged to admit," adds Dr. Bushnell "that the Canon was not made by men infallibly guided by the Spirit; and then the possibility appears to logically follow that, despite of any power they had to the contrary, some book may have been let into the Canon which, with many good things, has some specks of error in it"

Horace is clearly trying to drive a wedge. The edge was one verse, two or three chapters make a considerable rent; and a whole book finishes the work of disruption. It seems clear he is pleased with his undertaking. There is no regret at robbing God's children of their legacy. He ruthlessly plies his destructive logic to rob us even of the last word of God. For if what he says is true, he can not put his finger on one such word in all his Bible; and he seems pleased to be rid of every syllable from Heaven. However confident he may feel in the execution done by his last stroke, he must now be told that what we have just quoted demonstrates he has no real insight into the subject on which he so complacently dogmatizes. He talks very confidently of the men who made the Canon. Does he know who they were? He has evidently been poisoned by the flippant infidelity of Gibbon, who talks about the Apocalypse being voted into the Canon by a very few votes of the Bishops. In writing thus, that learned infidel shows just as great ignorance as Bushnell of the way the New Testament was formed.

These books were in the hands of the Christian congregations two hundred years before Constantine's bishops assembled at Nicæa to make fools of themselves, and havoc of the Church of God. Had the credit of the Apocalypse depended on the vote of bishops, it would never have formed part of the Canon at all. The book was never a favorite with the hierarchy, because it looked black on her who was beginning to be so busy with the kings of the earth. Why, then, did they not cast the threatening book out of the Canon? for, surely, they had the power. They had not. Gibbon altogether misleads Bushnell here. The book was, long before Nicæa, in the hands and hearts of God's children. The apostolic fathers were not afraid of the Apocalypse. They, to a man, gloried in the coming of the reign of Christ; for they were sure of sharing his throne. When did bishops cherish such a hope?

Our logician will still cavil. Suppose it was the Churches of the first and second centuries that formed the Canon, what security have we that they did not mistake? The doubt is only removed a

step back—say two hundred years. Did the disciples of the penman of the Apocalypse share his infallibility? Assuredly, Dr. Bushnell is confounded. His ignorance here is the very thing that disqualifies him for writing on the subject of inspiration. *John's disciples knew infallibly what* was the Word of God; a knowledge of which Dr. Bushnell has not the smallest conception. What does John say to his disciples, 1 John ii, 20? "And you, ye have an anointing from the Holy One, and know all things." They had therefore no difficulty in knowing where the Apocalypse, as well as all the other book of the Bible, came from. "My sheep know my voice," said the Good Shepherd. If he speaks, we may be sure he will speak so as to be not only heard by his sheep, but understood. *Those who are not his sheep know not his voice.*

So earnest was the apostle John that his children should be aware of their distinction in possessing this anointing, which secured them from all mistake in the things of God, that he returns to the delightful theme again in verse 27: "And you, the anointing which ye received from him abideth in you, and ye have no need that any one should teach you; but as his anointing teacheth you concerning all things, and is true, and is no lie, and even as he taught you, abide in him." Here, then, is the golden link that joins our faith to the inspiration of the apostles.

III. In H. W. Beecher's leader on what he calls "inspiration," we have, if we mistake not, a remarkable instance of that confident talking which distinguished some in the time of Paul, who, "desiring to be teachers of the law," understood "neither what they said nor whereof they affirmed." He does not trouble himself or his readers about "*plenary*" inspiration, but proceeds to settle the whole question in a few lines. And, in this, he would have done well, had he only allowed Christ and his apostles to be heard; for, in that case, a few lines would have been sufficient to state and establish the truth of God. But it is painfully significant of what spirit he writes under, when, in exact imitation of his predecessors, Alford and Bushnell, he never allows Christ and Paul and Peter to say one word on the subject. He rushes into his theme, in oracular style, thus: "Men, when they talk of inspiration, generally mean only the inspiration of the Scriptures." He then snubs them for their narrowness:

"The inspiration of the Scriptures is a great fact; but the inspiration of all the true children of God is a greater fact."

This is a striking example of the way in which Mr. Beecher is in the habit of so mixing up truth and error, that not one in a hundred, perhaps, of his million disciples can distinguish the one from the other. "The inspiration of the Scriptures is a great fact." *That* is the great truth on the subject—inspiration *is* a *fact*, if the word of Christ and his apostles may be depended on. But "the inspiration of all true children of God"—if the word inspiration is used in the same sense as before—so far from being "*a greater fact*," is just no fact at all, but a very daring falsehood. There is no commoner trick of sophists than to use a word in two senses, and then adroitly to put the one for the other. There *is* a sense, a *very* inferior one, in which all the true children of God are inspired. "For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God." "If any man has not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his." There is no doubt, therefore, that all Christians have the spirit, and are *so far* inspired. But does that prove that all they write, even on the subject of religion, is *inspired*, in the sense that the Bible is inspired? That is just what Mr. Beecher asserts; and, to speak with moderation, even he never made a grosser mistake in his life. It were, indeed, a most enormous fact, if all the articles in the *Christian Union* penned by the "true children of God" were really inspired. What wagon-loads of inspiration annually leave New York, to enlighten, to warm, to guide, to animate, to quicken the readers who wait for the words, the inspired words, of this oracle! Now, soberly, will Mr. Beecher stand to this?

True, he does not say that *he* himself is inspired; but, surely, he implies it when he says that "all the true children of God are inspired," and gives F. Robertson as an instance. He actually says, or implies very plainly, that "F. R. was as really inspired as Paul, though not to the same degree." Of course, what was true of the British preacher is true also of the Brooklyn one.

The singular absurdity of this assertion prompted us to look into F. Robertson, to see what the fascination might be that so upset his American admirer. In a volume of posthumous sermons, republished in Boston, we have looked into one entitled, "The Sacrifice of Christ;" and we are sorry to say that those who published such

hasty, indigested compositions were, in our judgment, no true friends of the preacher's reputation. The sermons, it seems, were extemporaneous effusions, only written out after preaching, and the one just referred to, certainly carries all the marks characteristic of such an origin, notwithstanding the flashes of genius that occasionally burst forth.

The preacher's fine education enabled him to correct his text (2 Cor. v, 14, 15): "For the love of Christ constraineth us; because we thus judge that if one died for all, then all died," (not "then were all dead," as Cor. v has it,) "and that he died," etc. But on the very page on which he corrects the received version, he seems to forget his own correction, and speaks of "the dead" of the first verse being "'they that live' of the second."

It is more important to observe, however, that though he seizes the true idea of the apostle, as teaching that Christ died as our representative, and that therefore his death was our death, he seems unable to hold fast the great truth which is the essence of Christianity: "The Lord laid on him the iniquity of us all." Yet he denies (page 116) that God, by an act of will, chose to consider that every act which Christ did was done by us; that he imputed or reckoned to us the baptism in the Jordan, and the victory in the wilderness, and the agony in the garden; or that he believed, or acted as if he believed, that when Christ died, each of us died. In this last clause the preacher clearly forgets his own correction of his text: "*If one died for all, then all died.*" As to what God believed about it, we will not speculate; but, most assuredly, he "acts as if he believed" that Christ's death was our death. And it is just as certain that the agony in the garden was the punishment of our sins, which "were laid on him." Certainly, he had no sins of his own to answer for; and if he answered for ours, then his agony, in law, was our ours, just as his death was ours. The victory in the wilderness, too, was our victory. Satan was our enemy; and Christ in smiting him, even to destruction, won our battle, and not only delivered us from the fear of death, but made us sharers of his throne. In ordering John to lay him beneath the water of Jordan, he "fulfilled all righteousness," and that righteousness becomes ours when we are buried with him in the water, which he commands, and rise with him into a new life.

This is a fair sample of the inconsistencies that deform this sermon; and this is the writing which H. W. Beecher is pleased to pronounce as *really* inspired as Paul's Epistles, *though not so much so*. "Compare the writings of Paul and of Frederick Robertson, for example, by the standard of spiritual power and richness. We say Paul was the more highly inspired, because, in point of fact, we find in his writings a fullness, a spiritual insight, a moral enthusiasm, which neither Robertson nor any other modern writer [not even Mr. H. W. Beecher] has equaled." Well, we cordially agree with Mr. H. W. Beecher for once. Certainly, neither Frederick Robertson nor he has, as yet, equaled Paul in fullness, spiritual insight, or moral enthusiasm. However, as the latter believes himself really in the true line of inspiration on which Paul "ran his course," he probably hopes to come near the apostle before he dies. He will come nearer him than he is now, when he knows himself well enough to be aware that he (H. W. B.) is *not really* inspired.

---

#### IV.—OUR CREED-MAKERS.

IN every creed, the finite and infinite logically exchange places. A creed does not more declare what shall be believed than it does what shall not be believed. It must assume, in the nature of the case, that it contains all the elements requisite for a standard in morals, a model in character, and a perfection in life. These, however, are only attainable by those principles which are derived directly from the Infinite, and the possessor must therefore be an infinite being. The maker or creator must be greater than the thing made or created; and a creed, therefore, with its claimed perfections, if such perfections really existed within it, could be made only by God. A man—a council of men, who exercise such high prerogatives, thus practically and logically assume the character of the Infinite, and the principles which they lay down must, if possessing any value for man, be reduced to a finite standard, or brought within the grasp of finite beings. Yet the maker of the creed is a finite being, assuming



to limit the Infinite by his own powers, and compass the mind of God within the *ego credo* of man.

It is to no purpose to answer here, that God has furnished the material for this *ego credo*; for if this were logically true—that is, logically accepted—then just that which God has furnished would be accepted without the superaddition of human limits or interpretations. But, as previously stated, the creed is both positive and negative, declaring with equal emphasis that which shall and shall not be believed. Neither will it avail any thing in the argument to seek justification for creed-making on the ground that difference of mental structure, habit, or education, requires different symbols of faith; for such a plea must assume that God, the infinite, either did not know beforehand what condition of mental life and action his truth would meet, or, knowing it, was not able to provide for it, thus leaving to the creed-maker—the finite—the task of exchanging places with him, and supplementing his work by such an adaptation of his truth to man as he had failed to make. Against all such assumptions the “Current Reformation” has entered its solemn protest, by declaring that “the Word of God is the all-sufficient rule for faith and practice.” Now, however, comes the real question to be met: Can the Word of God be accepted *per se*, as the creed for man? This question is one which our religious contemporaries have a right to ask, and one which the “Current Reformation” is bound, alike by its honor and its plea, to answer—to answer, too, in plain and unequivocal terms, both in its philosophy and its practice.

#### I.—ITS PHILOSOPHY.

That man has a right to endeavor, “by searching, to find out God,” will hardly be called in question; that in the study of God in his works, or in his truth, man may approach toward him, will also be conceded. But can man find expression in the Word of God sufficient for the perfection of life and character—sufficient for questions of faith, discipline, government, organization, practical work, with the endless outgrowths and developments which ought to follow the acceptance of a Divine standard, without imposing upon the Divine model his own workmanship, or fashioning the temple of truth with his own hands? The first feature of the philosophy assumed by the current plea, is that a direct use and application can

be made of the Word of God, without the aid of interpretation. It declares that God says what he means, and means what he says. The creed-maker, on the other hand, interposes an interpretation between the Word of God and the person proposing to appropriate that Word, and thence uses that interpretation instead of the Word. This, perhaps, were not so objectionable, if interpretations ceased at that point; but immediately it is discovered that different minds are as much at variance on the interpretation as on the Bible itself, thus giving rise to the necessity of interpreting the interpretation; which process may proceed almost *ad infinitum*. But must the principle, that God says what he means, and means what he says, be taken without limit or qualification? Evidently not; and for reasons which it is hoped will be made apparent, and that without destroying the principle itself. But before attempting to present those reasons, let the soundness of the motto or principle be tested, and its philosophy made apparent. That it is a sound, correct, and safe principle, *as a general rule*, the following will, perhaps, sufficiently demonstrate:

1. Figures of speech, ironical and sarcastic language, with all open or covert attempts to deceive or lead astray, dismissed from the question, it may be safely affirmed that all speakers, whether human or divine, intend to convey their own thoughts to the minds of others, simply and only by the words they use; and that, in proportion to the importance of the matter under consideration, will be the effort to choose such, and only such, words as will, in the simplest manner, convey that meaning. Some elements of no little consequence, of course, enter into this; such as the ability, wisdom, goodness, and knowledge of the speaker. A lack or failure in these, on the part of the speaker, may produce a corresponding failure on the part of the hearer to understand the meaning of the words, or from the words to get the exact meaning or ideas of the speaker. As no such things will be claimed with respect to the Word of God, those elements of possible unintelligibility may be dismissed from the question. Further, it must be claimed as a positive element, that the very first and most essential feature contained in a claim for a revelation from God is, that man may understand what he says. To maintain otherwise, would be to introduce God to the world as a being invested with less of either ability or disposition to be

understood than is man ; for it is evident, beyond all dispute, that man is capable of making himself understood in the most direct and absolute manner, without the interposition of an interpreter. So true is this, and so universally recognized, that all the business of the world, involving all the interests with which man is concerned—not even omitting, at times, the issues of life and death—proceeds upon it. The assumption, therefore, that great learning or extraordinary wisdom is necessary to the understanding of the Word of God, implies, of necessity, that he has spoken only to the wise and learned few ; and, as a sequence, that none others can be directly benefited by what he has spoken. This places the unlettered masses at the mercy of the Jew, and invests them with higher prerogatives than, under the view in question, God has exercised for himself. Surely, no pope or priest could wish to wear a more regal crown. Nor is the worst yet ; it places God in the position of having thus left his Word to be interpreted, without indicating who or how many shall be the interpreters, or what degree of attainment in wisdom and learning may be necessary to constitute a reliable interpreter ; from which it follows that, under the best system of interpretation possible to construct, all interpreters must be self-constituted, both as to their office and the qualifications for that office. It follows, further, that as no man can fully understand his own wants—much less the wants of others—for both time and eternity, his self-constituted judgeship with respect to God's Word will lead him into perpetual errors and mistakes, will cause him to lead others astray, and involve him in endless controversies with counter interpretations which proceed from men claiming, and, so far as any law or rule to the contrary is known, possessing equal right to interpret and construe. If from the foregoing we can not certainly deduce the principle that God says what he means, and means what he says, we shall at least be satisfied that no very great benefit is to be derived from the conflicting claims of the self-elected judges of that meaning.

2. A still greater difficulty environs the subject. It is possible, very frequently, when in doubt about the meaning of the words of a man, to approach him and ask an explanation. This presupposes he is a living man, and accessible. This advantage is lost with respect to the Word of God. The prophets and apostles are not ; and the

Fathers, do they live forever? Even Christ has long since ceased to manifest himself, either in person or by the direct communications of his Spirit, to those who love him. Their words are on record; that record has been preserved and transmitted to these ends of the earth. If, now, it be assumed that Christ or any of his apostles spoke only for the few, who and where are the chosen ones? True, while on earth, it may be claimed, and at once admitted, that Christ oftentimes spoke only to, and only for, a chosen few; but it must be borne in mind, also, that if his sayings were dark to them, he became his own interpreter, and also that one special part of his earthly mission was to prepare those whom he chose to bear his Word to the whole world. Was, then, Christ deficient in disposition or ability to make himself understood? And, if so, how shall we reach him to know his mind? Or did his apostles fail to apprehend him, and hence fail to convey his will to the world? If so, how shall we penetrate their graves and ask from their sealed lips the hidden meaning which their words have failed to convey? This difficulty might be obviated by the constant presence of the Holy Spirit in the world and with the Church, striving with the one and guiding the other; that is, in what is ordinarily called the miraculous manner. But this also is denied us; no visible light is now in the temple; no still, small voice now whispers the pure truth into the ear of man; no guiding star, direct from God, goes before man in his pathways of earth; no one now says to the fainting, trembling disciple, Fear not, I am with you,—only the Word of God, only the record of those voices, only the reflected light of those stars, only the approach by faith into the presence of Him who stood by Paul in visible manifestations of extraordinary or miraculous power.

3. In the next place, it is to be shown that there exists no necessity for any special law of interpretation for the Bible, nor, indeed, for any essential modification of the literal mode under consideration. The first noteworthy point under this head is, that the so-called difficult passages of Scripture are such, more on account of the doctrines they are used to sustain than on account of any peculiar obscurity or hidden meaning in the words themselves. It might be severe, but it is thought true, to say, that most systems of education in theological departments have, in

accordance with the principle herein first enunciated, reversed the whole order of things, not only logically causing the infinite and finite to exchange places, but particularly in this respect, that theology takes precedence of the Scriptures, and the Scriptures must bend to its dicta. Our country abounds in theological institutions, lavish in their means and elaborate in their appointments for the benefit of their students. But it must be observed that, as a rule, their theology is defined with metes and bounds well-nigh as clearly marked as the bounds of their grounds and buildings, and those who enter upon their courses do so with, practically, the pledge in advance that they will conform to, and practice upon, the systems therein taught. It is no less true of the Bible than of any thing else, that no one can gain clear conceptions of truth, or attain to grand and sublime views of God, who approaches both him and his truth with ideas already possessed and conclusions already drawn. But the creed-makers, having already decided what theology is, are not slow to declare what the Scriptures are, and of necessity must be, in order to be the defense of, and harmonize with, that theology.

Reverse this order; put the Bible in its proper place, and allow simple truth to assume its normal condition; approach that truth with the mind as an unwritten page; yield the mind to the plastic hand of God in his truth; let the mind become passive and receptive, instead of active and suggestive; and most of the supposed difficulties will disappear, and many Scriptures now forming the basis of disputes among the followers of Christ, and divisions in his body, will become transparent as crystal and beautiful as light.

A second noteworthy feature is, that many love darkness rather than light, and that, therefore, an effort must be made to put out the light. This is evidenced in the almost endless laws and counter-laws of Biblical interpretation, wherein the effect is either to obscure all sensible meaning, or actually array Scripture against Scripture, until the whole shall become a bundle of absurdities, inconsistencies, contradictions, or impossibilities. Here the realms of philosophy and science are alike explored, and all the hidden treasures of antiquity put under tribute. Not one stone is left upon another in the great temple of the world's religions, nor do even the throne and being of God escape the searching ordeal. But does one inquire,

Why all this? he will be astounded at the naked logic of the answer. Is it a work of pure benevolence? Are men of learning such philanthropists? Will a strict observance of the precepts of the Bible work havoc and ruin? Do men become highway robbers and murderers by imitating the Nazarene? Will the eternal future roll its waves of ire upon those who listen to and obey the voice of God?

Nothing of all this. If men were to introduce Shakespeare or Byron, Milton or Bacon, as their standards of truth, and the land should be filled with those preaching, Except you believe in Shakespeare, ye shall be damned, not one voice would be raised against them, not one protest entered against their doctrine, not one book to disprove their theories; or, if voices were raised, they would be but the mingled voices of pity and contempt for the deluded victims of a worthless gospel.

If the Bible be really what is claimed for it by those now under consideration, or if they, without doubt, hesitancy, or mental reservation, accepted it as such, certainly they should give themselves no more trouble to disprove its claims or overthrow its authority than they would if any other book should set up similar claims. But the truth is apparent; the claims of Divinity are not hollow claims, and men feel this; the appeal of the Bible to the moral nature of man is no idle appeal, and very few have gone so far in the direction of moral obtuseness as to be entirely deaf to its voice. Hence the necessity of either heeding it, which signifies a life of self-denial and holiness, or an attempt to silence its voices by removing it from its Divine, and therefore from its authoritative, basis. It is enough to say that, when the heart and life can bear the full rays of light as reflected from the Divine image, there will be no even so-called conflict or antagonism between nature and revelation, and no efforts will be made to seek, to find, or establish it. No efforts will be needed, either, to make special interpretations of Scripture, and thus erect conflicting standards of judging and applying it; for then men will see eye to eye and face to face, and will speedily learn to speak the same things, and be perfectly joined together in the same mind; will see that God has spoken in kindness and love to his frail creature, man; will see that he has spoken as much for the benefit and blessing of the poor and lowly as for the learned and polite, and that his



words come with simple sweetness and purity and power to all hearts open to receive them.

## II.—ITS PRACTICE.

A saying need be no more trite than "It is one thing to preach, quite another to practice." The best philosophy in the world is often ruined by its votaries, and the soundest moral principles brought into disrepute by the partial or non-observance of them by those who profess to be governed by them. That the "Current Reformation" is liable to this charge, and has therefore rendered itself obnoxious to the criticisms of its religious contemporaries, can scarcely admit of a question. While some animadversions upon this may be in order, and will appear at the close of this paper, for the present it is the design to show the consistency of the practice of the Reformation, with the principle herein maintained, that the Scriptures say what they mean, and mean what they say.

1. The first essential feature to be observed is, that the Scriptures, particularly of the New Testament, are to be taken logically and chronologically, as biography, history, and Church laws; but, practically, as a harmonious whole, unified by one great principle, and permeated by one and the same spirit.

This great principle is briefly stated as the knowledge and application of God's mode of saving sinners; and the spirit pervading it must, therefore, be the Divine spirit. To consider it in any other light, is at once to introduce the custom of "scrapping," or "texting;" and thus the necessity for the creed-maker, in order to decide what particular texts are to be relied upon. This will be more apparent when it is remembered that creeds and creed-makers usually contain and decide upon certain technical doctrines, rather than the whole doctrine of the New Testament. It not unfrequently happens, in this way, that doctrines purely incidental to the main questions are introduced—doctrines which might or might not be believed without endangering any one's salvation, yet made tests of fellowship in, and foundations of, the Church. Christ is thus lost sight of, and the power vested alone in him and in his blood to save and to cleanse becomes, in the mind of the believer, transferred to the symbol of faith he may have accepted.

2. Observe, in the second place, that no one book of the New

Testament contains a complete statement of Divine law and human duty ; that only by a comparison of all, can the entire plan of salvation be educed. How utterly hopeless, hence, the task of undertaking by special texts to lead sinners into the full appreciation of, and obedience to, the Divine law! Themes, therefore, instead of texts, life instead of doctrine, and Christ instead of creed, must gain the attention and win the heart, before the Gospel can be duly appreciated or intelligently obeyed.

What, now, claims this Reformation ?

First of all, that no question is asked as a test of faith, except the one great question of faith in Christ as the Son of God. Upon the ordinary evidence of such faith, baptism is administered, and the person becomes at once a member in full fellowship in the Church.

This is claimed to be the practice of the Reformation, for which many are now pleading; and the practice is based upon the simple assumption that the Scriptures which teach such a mode of procedure are not in the least doubtful in their meaning. Now that such Scriptures exist, and that their, at least, apparent intent leads to such a course, few will have the hardihood to deny. The denial will come in upon the old creed-making principle, that these Scriptures seem to mean this, but can not be fully understood, and therefore not applied till interpreted; and this interpretation turns out, as is usual in such cases, to be only a means of introducing some other mode of procedure, already decided upon and practiced. It further occurs that the interpretation will be met by others with equal claim for correctness, and other practices follow.

For example, in the case stated, one will inquire, In what sense is Christ the Son of God? or, In what sense do you understand the relationship between Christ and God? or, In what manner are you impressed with that faith? is it a natural belief of testimony, or a supernatural influence upon the soul? can it be exercised by the functions of mind, or must it flow only at the good pleasure of God? These, and all kindred questions, the Reformation refuses to entertain; or, if to answer them, to do so only as an expression of opinion, without incorporating them into a system of faith, much less making them tests of a genuine conversion.

Again, it is asked by what mode the Spirit operates in its work of conversion and sanctification, and straightway arise almost endless

disputes, which, if ever settled, will leave men as much in the dark as before; since, in the nature of the question of Spirit, one can not be fully satisfied even as to the operations of his own, much less the Spirit of the great and Infinite One.

To remedy these difficulties, it is assumed by the current plea, that God's operations are his own, whether, so to speak, in person or by his Spirit; that whatever promises he makes, he will fulfill; and that whatever work his Spirit has to perform, it will do it, provided man is obedient to the Divine requirements. The question of the mode of spiritual operation is hence left as an untaught question, while the benefits to be derived therefrom are easily accepted, and joyfully appropriated by the true believer. That such is the evident teaching of the Scripture, simply upon its face, few will question; that endless interpretations may be given upon so recondite a subject, none will deny. A practice, however, based upon the simplest expression of the word, must be a consistent one, whatever else may be said concerning it. Such is the practice of the "Current Reformation."

Among perhaps the most difficult questions which creed-makers have attempted to settle, is that of determining at what particular stage of the Divine operation on the heart of the sinner is he sufficiently transformed into a saint to be admitted to the fellowship of the Church. This question, as the writer believes, has never been very satisfactorily settled, even in the minds of those who have deemed it so essential. Some occupy weeks, some months, and some even years, in the difficult problem; and many individuals carry doubts with them to their graves, on the (to them) all vital point of acceptance with God. It certainly seems that God does not intend thus to cast the clouds of doubt upon the heads of his children, or leave them to thread the labyrinths of life without the clear light of an undoubting faith. The practice under consideration disposes of the whole difficulty, by observing that, in the direct teaching of Christ and his apostles, no such questions were asked, no such difficulties introduced, to disturb and perplex the mind; but that, on the contrary, the penitent believer was immediately, the same day, the same hour of the night, admitted to the rite of baptism, and received into the fellowship of the Church.

Again, a very distinct practice obtains in respect to all questions of faith, as contrasted with questions of opinion. There must, with-

out doubt, be some limit to the comprehension of the Infinite by the finite.

But creed-makers do not seem to recognize this truth; and just where the mind should repose in a calm and child-like faith, undismayed by possible dangers, and undisturbed by the vast depths and dizzy heights beyond,—just there, the creed-maker must insist upon exchanging places again with the Infinite, and making known to man what God never revealed. The wildest speculations are indulged in; themes no human mind can possibly grasp are dealt with, in a style the most dogmatic; the eternity past and to come are unrolled like a panorama, what God has been doing “from all eternity” set forth with an air of assurance at once amazing and refreshing, the decrees of eternity unfolded, and the very number of the saved fixed with a certainty to which arithmetic is a stranger, and moral demonstrations totally unknown. Now, as touching these things, it is not intended to deny the right of investigation, or take away the indulgence in harmless speculations; it is only when these investigations assume the shape of oracles, and these speculations become formulated into symbols of faith, and authoritatively announced as guides to the faith and touch-stones to the conscience of man, that the Reformation lifts up its voice of warning and protest, and maintains the distinctive difference between faith and opinion,—basing the former upon the simple declaration of God’s Word in its most obvious meaning, and leaving men to roam at pleasure in the fields of the latter.

It is thus only, it is claimed, that any thing like a unity of faith can be attained, and the body of Christ brought into the oneness of character and harmony of action manifested and exemplified in the original model. That there are certain fundamental truths, certain plainly written statements, in the New Testament which all can agree upon, scarcely admits of a doubt. Those who are found to doubt this will also, very likely, be found to doubt the truths themselves. That there is a wide, a boundless field for speculation, is equally true; but these can only be indulged in by the tolerably well educated, if indeed by any save the highly cultured. But the Gospel was designed for those of lowest degree as well as highest; and hence the necessity of rejecting all questions of doubt, and those giving rise to “doubtful disputations,” and fixing the faith upon statements, and regulating the life by principles, which all can with

equal readiness apprehend and apply. Such is the practice of the "Current Reformation." It asks no questions, exacts no promises, and lays down no rules, either for individual Christian life or organic Church life, not contained expressly, or without doubt impliedly, in that Testament. It knows no authority but the Great Head of the Church and his divinely appointed apostles; holds no councils to decide upon Church polity or fix the limits of an orthodox faith. It adds no ordinances to those appointed by the Lord, dresses in no garb of pomp and display, and sits at the feet of the Master once each week, to eat of the symbol of his flesh, and drink of his blood.

In the early part of this paper it was conceded that the principle, the Scriptures mean what they say, and say what they mean, has its limits and qualifications. Farther along, in the opening paragraph on the practice of the "Current Reformation," it was also conceded that criticism might be justly made, upon the ground that this Reformation has not been altogether consistent with its own plea.

The reasons for these statements will now be presented. Truth in itself—that is, truth-ward or God-ward—need have, can have, no limit. Truth man-ward must be limited, first to the wants, and then to the capacity of man. As to the wants of man, truth will and must be variable: that is, what one man needs most, another may need least; wherein one is weakest, another may be strongest. The real character of Divine truth will therefore display itself in its flexibility to meet these varied wants. Not a flexibility that becomes licentious, or that departs from the truth itself; but one that proves itself capable of meeting all these wants without the sacrifice of its Divine character. Again, truth is limited by human capacity. What one readily apprehends, another may occupy a life-time in plodding through. It is not true, therefore, in an unqualified and unlimited sense, that the Scriptures say and mean alike to all, since all do not need alike, and are not alike capable. But let it be distinctly stated that this does not apply to the simple and elementary doctrines of the Word of God; for, as shown in the preceding pages, they can be apprehended and acted upon by all willing to believe them.

But there are things about Divine truth not elementary. There are the deep things of God, as well as the plain and simple: and it is when men enter these deep things of God; when they are capable

of growing up into something like the fullness of the stature of men in Christ Jesus ; when their souls no longer need milk, but are capable of taking the strong meat of Divine truth ; when they are no longer children tossed to and fro, but brave strong soldiers,—it is then that no one principle of either interpretation or action can be applied alike for all and to all. It is then that our creed-makers must feel their utter impotency to stay or satisfy the cravings of a mighty soul, reaching out with godlike powers toward its God-maker, and lifting itself up ever near and nearer the Divine image. It is just here that the Reformation is obnoxious to criticism. It has attempted a no less impossible thing than others have attempted, and practically has its creed-makers, or would-be creed-makers, in quite as distinctive a sense. Assuming, in many instances, to act upon the general principle of the simple meaning of Scriptures, it has been assumed that, without limitation or qualification, it is equally applicable to all. Progress has been decried ; development and outgrowth into the infinite reaches of truth have been styled “catering to the sects,” quoting “the Fathers” more than the apostles, and clinging to a “*thus* saith the Lord,” without attempting to extend the area of *what* saith the Lord, beyond a half-dozen favorite passages of Scripture ; denouncing, in most shameless violation of the cherished principles concerning opinions, those who differ from them in opinion ; pronouncing those “unsound” to whose strength and growth of inner life they are, by nature, education, and habit, alike strangers. These illustrations of the “Current Reformation” have, with propriety and justice, evoked the criticisms of careful observers, and merited the rebukes, from without and within, which they have received.

To limit the infinite to, and comprehend it by, the finite, is just as impossible with the “Current Reformation” as with any other cause or plea. To fix metes and bounds to the aspirations of a soul thirsting for near approach to and communion with God, by the *ipse dixit* of the Fathers or the *dixit ipse* of the sons, is as fruitless here as elsewhere ; and the attempt to comprehend the Word of God in the few initiatory rites of the Gospel, certainly, but poorly becomes those who plead for the Word of God, and all his Word. In a word, the spirit that seeks to limit Divine truth by its own conceptions of that truth, and bring the long and the short to its own Procrustean



rule, is the creed-making spirit; and those who have made but little or no advancement beyond the Acts of the Apostles, and seek to check the progress of others at their dead point, are the creed-makers of the "Current Reformation;" they are our creed-makers.

---

#### V.—GOD A THREEFOLD POSTULATE OF PSYCHOLOGY.

ON the rising ground just back of Lausanne, and bordering on one of the main streets, lies an ample inclosure abounding in verdant lawns and shaded walks, and crowned with a tasteful family residence. These walks command a full view of Lake Lemman on the south, and of the snow-capped mountains of Savoy beyond. From the north they are fanned by the fresh breezes from the Jura. The inclosure looks like an abode of reflection and poesy. And it is so, in fact. It is the favorite and favoring home of a genuine philosopher—M. Charles Secretan.

M. Secretan deserves and is destined to be more widely known than is yet the case. His philosophical system is sober and daring and healthful. It is a synthesis of the Scotch, French, and recent German tendencies, without being in the least syncretic. It is the maturing fruit of a life of manly, leisurely thinking. Its author has long been known as Teacher of Philosophy at the academies of Lausanne and Neuchatel. Twenty years ago he published the main features of his system in a work entitled, "*La Philosophie de la Liberté*." Since that time he has been busy in classifying and elaborating the principles there announced.

The merit of M. Secretan's philosophy is its evident soundness. Differing from most other rounded systems of metaphysics, it holds itself in harmony with the plain data of the general consciousness. It does not, like Spinoza, freeze our liberty and morality with the ice of mathematical fate; nor, like Kant, raise an impassable gulf between subject and object, the soul and God; nor, like Hegel, melt down the personality of man and God into an indiscriminate sea of being; nor, like Hamilton, lock in our thoughts to the transitory

sphere of the finite; nor, like the momentarily *a la mode* scientists, reduce man to dirt, and thought to a function of dirt. On the contrary, M. Secretan's philosophy not only does not sacrifice, but it is positively built upon, and constructed out of, the great proto-facts of liberty, conscience, and God.

In order to help to an idea of M. Secretan's principles and method, we shall now attempt a synoptical statement of three lines of thought by which psychology inevitably arrives at the notion of a personal God. Justice to the author, however, requires us to say that any such synopsis will be meagre and unsatisfactory. Our purpose and hope is simply to "blaze the way" for the reader, so that he may catch at least a distant view of the vast and fertile region through which the Vaudois philosopher has constructed such a broadly safe and solid highway.

The three golden threads of thoughts which we shall endeavor to gather up and place side by side before the reader's eye, take their origin from the three chief powers of man—the intellectual, the æsthetic, and the moral. They form three golden chains, holding triune man in vital union with his primitive Cause; three pathways upon which sober thought, a cultivated taste, and a consistent conscience spontaneously rise to, and lay hold upon, a personal God. The three thought-paths constitute a threefold postulate of God. Let us take up these chains in turn. And, first, as to

#### THE POSTULATE OF THE INTELLIGENCE.

The laws of thought form an organic system. The three stages of thought are, thesis, antithesis, and synthesis. Every thought involves a thesis, an affirmation. Every affirmation relates to some being. Its three elements are, the subject who thinks, the object thought, and that which the subject thinks of the object. What one thinks is, therefore, that the object is, and that it is so and so. In a general sense, to be thought and to *be*, are correlative. This is the logical principle of identity;  $a=a$ . An object that *is*, is *something* and in *some* manner; that is, it has existence and qualities. It is either a reality or a feigned reality. The notions of being and qualities are correlative; the sum of the qualities of an entity form its substance.

The most elementary law of the thesis is *unity*. Whatever be

the object of our thought, we necessarily regard it as *one*: First, one numerically; and second, one in itself. Taken thus, unity does not exclude plurality, but, in fact, embraces and permeates it. But the unity of quality is not identical with the unity of substance. The unity of a mass of sand differs from that of a single grain.

The notion of being implies a degree of *independence*. A quality is only in a being, but a being is *in itself*. The full scope of the notion of *being* is, to *exist of itself*. But this self-existent being or substance, we do not find it anywhere in the empirical world about us. It is *one*, but we know only of composites. The atoms of physicists, the ideas of logicians, are but resting-places for our wearied thought. Being is different from its qualities; but it is only *in* its qualities. The mind strives to rise beyond the contradiction, but the contradiction remains. Being and quality are conceived only by opposition to their contraries. The constituent elements of each being are offered to each other; so also its qualities. Sour and sweet are combined in the flavor of a good fruit. The pleasure of amassing contradicts that of giving, but does not exclude it. Every quality is limited, but only by its negation or its contrary. Every being has its own nature and its own idea; but it is not conceivable without other beings, and subsists only by them. The separated individuals are but one in a higher unity. The whole is but a member; but the member is itself a whole. This law of contradiction pervades all the categories of thought and being. A being, a substance, remains identical amid all its accidents; it is inseparable from its qualities. All we know of it is its qualities. What is it, then, that remains identical? Something must remain identical; but we can not comprehend it. The principle of identity remains, but is limited by contradiction: the thesis is opposed by an *antithesis*, the affirmation by a negation. This principle of contradiction, the second law of thought, is but another form of the law of identity; the contrary excludes its contrary.

Both principles are involved in all thought. Every object of thought seems to have within itself, and without itself, its contrary. These contraries coexist. This implies the third law of thought, that of combination or *synthesis*, which is the complement and explanation of the antithesis. No light without darkness, and the brighter the light the darker the darkness. The assimilating and

dispensing functions of the body are contrary; but they condition each other, and their unity constitutes life. Reason is opposed to imagination; but without imagination there is no reasoning possible, and without reasoning no valuable imagining. The law is universal; the contrasts must exist. It is the principle of harmony, of liberty, and peace. A contrary excludes its contrary; but the reality which embraces them reconciles them in a third term higher than the two first. Movement is not rest, and rest is not movement; but life consists in both; the highest forms of life, science, love, are, at the same time, movement in rest and rest in movement. But this synthesis of contraries is not the neutralization of the one by the other; but one of the terms predominates. And finally the mind rises from synthesis to synthesis toward an ultimate which has no contrary term. This ultimate is unity in its highest absolute sense. We arrive at it by process of abstraction—by eliminating the accidents or qualities which characterize individual objects, and thus passing up the scale from species to genus, class, etc., until we attain to that which is *common* to every possible object of thought; namely, simple substance. This ultimate substance must be the only and all-embracing *one*. The very attempt to think it as a plurality is futile; for the very thought that there are a plurality of substances assumes that substance is common to them all: and all qualityless substance is identical; that is, all substance, when stripped of its qualities, is simply and solely substance.

Such is the necessary law of thought; it can not but reduce all being to unity. But the mind is not satisfied with this result. As we rise in the scale of abstraction, the idea of substance loses its contrasts. The ultimate term has absolutely no qualities remaining. We can *affirm* nothing of it, and hence not even existence. Substance without qualities is impossible. But what, then, is the highest positive idea of substance, or being? Answer: Substance, or being, is the subject of quality. Now, we know qualities only by the impressions made upon us; hence, substance, or being, is that which acts upon us. The notion of being is, therefore, that of something which acts or can act. If now individuals, single beings, do not exist *of themselves*, they must be the product of an action. Hence, we are brought to the two positions: substance, in the relative sense, is that which acts upon us; substance, in the absolute sense,

is that whose activity produces agents. Now, activity implies *movement*. Under this term fall all thought and all being. Substances are the seats of movements; but all movement involves a mover: hence, the problem of a plurality of beings becomes the problem of a plurality of causes.

We find the notion of existence in ourselves, in the consciousness that we *are*. But this consciousness is an act. It is as an active being that we know ourselves; we are the cause of our movements. To this notion of cause are we forced, by the laws of thought, to give universal validity: thus, whatever takes place has a cause. This principle evidently forces the mind toward unity. In seeking the cause of each fact in an antecedent fact, and of a plurality of facts in single causes, we come ultimately to a first cause, which is the cause of all secondary causes. An infinite series of causes explains nothing. There must be an end to the chain—a cause which is uncaused, or which is cause *per se*. This true cause, which is an origin and not a mere transmission of causality, can exist only in the true substance, the being existing of itself and as cause of itself. Thus we find that the laws of thought call equally for one sole, absolute, self-existing substance, and for one ultimate universal first cause of all secondary causes.

On examining the complex of dependent existences, we often meet with facts which tend to reproduce themselves. In this sense, creatural life is cause of itself. The circulation of the blood in the arteries determines the activity of the organs which produce the blood which feeds the heart; which, in turn, impels the blood in the arteries. This complex relation in which the effect is cause of its own cause, is that of *end*. When I pursue an end, the idea of the thing to be done is the cause of the efforts wherewith I pursue it. The law, whatever is or is done has an end or purpose, certainly expresses a natural tendency of the human mind. Though we do not actually see the end of any thing, yet the mind constantly struggles toward that consummation. This law of *finality* or end is a new form of the enchainment of the multiple to unity or in unity. Practically we discover only particular ends, but theoretically the mind seeks no less necessarily a supreme absolute end of all things than a universal first cause.

This notion of end brings us back to that of organism, of which

it is an essential trait. The law of organism is the supreme law of thought. In a material organism, the whole exists before the parts; it is realized in its particular organs; and the functions of the organs incessantly produce the life of the whole. The parts are at once cause and effect of each other. The organism is its own end. So is it also with the laws of thought. The laws of substantiality, of causality, and of finality, apply to each other, and the common ground of them all is the law of unity. In thought, and in the object of thought, plurality calls for and implies unity. The substance is one, the cause is one, the end is one, embracing in itself the unlimited plurality of substances, causes, and ends; and the true substance is also the true cause and the true end. It is constantly identical, both in so far as substance, in so far as cause, and in so far as end. We affirm this by the law of unity. Either we must accept all these consequences, or flatly deny the principles of unity, causality, and finality, upon which are based all the operations of the mind in the study of finite things, and also even the possibility of knowledge in general.

But the substantial cause, the substance which is both substance and cause, and whose essence consists in producing, is *Spirit*; and the sole intelligible end is perfection. But the perfect spirit is *God*. Thus the human mind affirms God by the necessity of its structure, and the organism of its laws is the very image of God, its author.

But how bridge over the chasm between thought and reality? The end of thought is knowledge. Knowledge is a relation between two terms regarded as independent of each other. In knowing, we do not assume to create reality, but only to comprehend it as it is independently of us. Now, therefore, as thought is essentially an organism, so must also the object of thought be an organism, a being and a system of beings, one in its source and in its end. The whole universe must be an organism; every thing must proceed from, and return to, *God*. Otherwise the laws of being would differ from the essential laws of thought. But can we prove that they do not? Can we absolutely demonstrate the correctness of our knowledge in general? We can not. A perfect demonstration is that which connects a thesis with its principle and cause. But as God is the ultimate principle, the first cause, we can not prove his existence by any anterior principle or cause. We are at the term. The



necessary laws of thought lead to God, but there stop. The proposition, "God exists," can not be attached to any proposition more certain, and hence can not be proved by any thing outside of itself. But it does not need such proof; it is already the cumulative, inevitable affirmation of the necessary laws of thought. Hence, if not the most certain, it is at least as certain as any possible element of our knowledge. But is *any* of our knowledge real? To doubt it is impossible; for the very doubter would have to assume the reality of his mind, which doubted. We can not prove that we exist, but we are conscious of it. This consciousness we can not escape. We are conscious of thinking and of the laws of thought. We can not prove the reality of our thinking, but infinitely less can we disprove it. We spontaneously believe in the necessary laws of thought; but these laws imply the reality of ourselves, of God, and of creatures. Hence, we spontaneously and unavoidably believe in such reality. Thus, we come to the principle: The laws of thought and the laws of reality answer to each other, and rest on the same basis.

To believe in the identity of the laws of thought and of the laws of being, is equivalent to believing in truth. Now, if it is true that the logical development of the laws of thought conducts necessarily to the idea of God, the absolute being, cause, and end, as their true focal point, it clearly follows,—first, that there is no particular proof of God's existence, since there is no higher truth upon which this proof could be based; and, secondly, that to believe in truth and to believe in God are but one and the same act. To believe in truth, is the *germ*; to believe in God, is the *germ developed*. God is thus the foundation of all truth for the intelligence which receives it, as, in the objective world, he is the foundation of all substantial being. God is at once the principle that causes that things are, and the principle that causes that they are known. As all knowledge rests at bottom on an implicit certainty of God, and, in a cultivated spirit, on the *express* certainty of God, hence we are justified in saying that God is *the truth, per se*.

From this it is evident that the question of the existence of God presents itself very differently from the question as to the existence of any particular limited being or object. In respect to particular beings, we distinguish their idea from their actual existence; I can, *e. g.*, form a clear idea of a certain horse, whether such a horse exists

or not. But if God *were* not, then there could neither be any thing, nor any thing be conceived. We can therefore say of God, and of God alone, that his existence is implied in his idea. We could not truly have the idea of God without, at the same time, being certain that he exists. The existence of God is therefore a clear postulate of the intelligence.

The second path which M. Secretan represents as leading out directly from the soul to God is of æsthetic character. It may be termed

#### THE POSTULATE OF THE ÆSTHETIC NATURE.

Æsthetic is sensitive. The sentiments or feelings are of reflectional character. The simple feeling is a consciousness in which the observer and the state observed are not separated. The feelings or sentiments are of the two classes, corporeal and intellectual. Among the latter class, the æsthetic sentiments hold a place apart. Æsthetic pleasure or suffering does not arise from the fact that we have recognized an æsthetic or an unæsthetic quality in the object. On the contrary, we attribute to it such quality because of the pleasure or unpleasure which its real or imagined presence makes us experience. Whence comes this pleasure? It is not from an impression upon our senses, but from a thrill of the soul. It is the peculiarity of the beautiful to stir the activity of the intelligence, to awaken the moral faculties. Thus the æsthetic sentiments stand in relation with the reason. Æsthetic sentiments spring from three kinds of causes,—moral, natural, or artistic.

A thought, an act, awaken in us the sentiment of the beautiful; and we call them beautiful when they seem to spring from a beautiful source, a beautiful mind, a beautiful soul. But when is, or how can, a soul be beautiful? A beautiful thought is a pregnant one—a thought which awakens in us many others, and which yet seems to have presented itself to the spirit spontaneously. A beautiful action is one in which egotistic and sensuous motives are subordinated to disinterested ones, without this victory having cost any thing—a sacrifice made without effort. A beautiful mind, a beautiful soul, is therefore one in which great thoughts and generous decisions take place easily and naturally. A sublime thought is a relatively clear view of the infinite. A sublime action is a resolution which breathes

of the moral infinite by the easy triumph of the moral will over the greatest obstacles.

The beautiful in nature is that which reveals an intention, an idea, which the soul feels but can not formulate. Not every thing that pleases the eye is beautiful. Beauty belongs properly only to those features of nature which express a design, which are apt to awaken in the soul the sentiments of grace or grandeur, of serenity or melancholy. Organic bodies, in which every thing seems to point to an end, though that end is not fully understood, awaken very distinct æsthetic sentiments. We call beautiful those whose forms, independently of their utility, seem adapted to awaken a certain class of vague and indefinable ideas closely related to intellectual beauty. These forms have always a certain analogy to the human form, without yet producing any illusion—thus: the horse, the swan, the eagle, the lion, the lily, the palm-tree, etc., objects from which all languages have borrowed so many metaphors—while the face of the ape, the naked skin of the ostrich, etc., appear to us unbeautiful because of their too *close* resemblance. The human form is, for man, the type and source of the beauty which consists in lines and contours. But wherein lies the beauty of the human figure? It is not in the expression of precise ideas; for beauty differs essentially from expression. Nor is it a physical effect; beauty is a specific kind of expression. It consists in a relation between a certain form and an idea which can be expressed only in that form. Sublime scenes in nature are those which awaken in us the sentiment of our greatness by the contrast of our infirmity. Thus, the sea and the starry heavens,—we are as nothing in the presence of their immensities; but we know them, and they know us not. The storm, the cataract, the conflagration,—we can not resist these; but we are free, which they are not.

If we succeed anywhere in discovering the secret of beauty, it will be with the artist. What is the distinctive character of his work? The beautiful in art is not an imitation of nature; for the artist *selects* in nature. The artist selects forms in order to translate certain ideas which are peculiar to him. He attaches beauty to objects which might be without it, or he expresses it by creations absolutely original. Thus, true music imitates nothing. Artistic beauty is a language for the expression of the transcendental. In the antique world and in Christian history, all the arts stood in

relation to religion. They served to represent, in visible forms, Deity and Divine attributes; that is, the infinite or perfection—a nature higher than the terrestrial. Man tended toward this, and for the evident reason that it is in harmony with his nature to pursue it. It is a nature higher than the human that the words ideal and beauty express.

To make the infinite felt in the finite; to translate into matter, not a specific idea, but spirit in general; to transfer the spirit into a better world by means of elements furnished from this,—such is the problem of art, such the secret of beauty. In this ideal world, every thing is of exalted character by its very nature, without any effort. Its separate features, however, are always suggested by our actual experiences. In one sense, man is his own ideal; and the perfect symbol of the ideal, the beautiful form *par excellence*, is the human body, as disengaged from all the defects, exaggerations, and accidents of the individual.

The felt need of creating a world better and more beautiful than this one; the melancholy and the unsatisfied desires which are inspired in us by works of high art and by beautiful scenes in nature; the sadness usually characteristic of the most *naïve* forms of art (for example, that of the instinctive popular music of almost all lands); in a word, a thousand traits revealed by the study of the sentiments,—appear to suggest the thought that the conditions of our present life are not normal, that we were made for a better existence, that our nature and destiny are fortuitous. This feeling has, in fact, always prevailed in humanity.

The history of the origin of the arts proves that the sentiment of the beautiful is intimately allied to the sentiment of religion. While true that the religious sentiment is influenced by the ideas we entertain of Deity, it is also true that these ideas themselves are suggested by our entire spiritual organization. The fundamental trait of the religious sentiment is the fear of a superior power on which we are dependent. But this trait, when developed, involves all the sentiments due to an absolutely perfect personality; namely, reverence for Omnipotence, love for perfect goodness, admiration for sovereign wisdom, an aspiration in the subject toward all perfection, the conviction that this perfection is objectively real, and a desire to be united to it. The idea of God answers to all these wants,

and one word sums up their full significance,—adoration. Without attributing to God the qualities that belong only to visible forms, we yet find in him the source and substance of all beauty.

Thus the heart no less than the head, the æsthetic nature no less than the intelligence, testify to the existence of God. As the mind calls for God as the absolute cause and the absolute end, so the heart is so constructed as to aspire to an object absolutely admirable, and to demand that this object be a veritable reality. Such is the postulate of the æsthetic nature.

The third path upon which the soul inevitably arrives at God, lies in the implications of our moral nature. It is

#### THE POSTULATE OF THE CONSCIENCE.

In acting, man is universally conscious that he is free; but he is also conscious that his liberty has a law which it can, but should not, violate. This consciousness is the conscience. In pronouncing in particular cases, the conscience uniformly applies, wittingly or unwittingly, certain general rules which are the definitions of virtue, or the virtues. The unity, the content, of these definitions is the idea of the good. Good is the synthesis of the essential and the permanent in man and the universe. The immediate and, as it were, instinctive certainty of a general obligation, is the testimony which reason renders to itself in the soul. The idea of obligation and of moral good are inseparable. The question is not, Are we obliged to realize the good? but, What is good? What is needed is, therefore, to determine the goods, the ends of liberty; and, from these, the virtues will follow, as a matter of course. But the settling of the end of life is inseparable from the solving of the problem, What is the essence of man? Thus the moral problem is coincident, in the last instance, with the metaphysical problem. On consulting our consciousness, and that of the race as a whole, we observe that the supreme end of the moral activity is to contribute, as much as possible, to the progress and well-being of humanity entire. The sovereign good would therefore be a life in which each devoted himself to the good of all, and in which all that depended on human liberty should be shaped by that spirit. In this state, which would be the ideal of humanity, we would realize the most perfect unity of the race on the basis of the liberty of the individuals. It follows

from this, that the highest good is *unity*, and that the virtue of virtues is *love*. But what is the anchor of this unity? what is the basis of this love? It is a unity and a love that spring from general moral obligation. Obligation involves a will higher than ours. The moral law obliges, because it is the expression of such a will. Nothing but will can oblige a will. The will which obliges us is not the collective will of humanity; for humanity lives only in the individuals. But the demands of the moral law are absolute; hence, the will which imposes it is an absolute one. But as will exists only in a personal being, hence the will which enacts the moral is that of an absolute personality. But the absolute personality is *God*. Thus, as our intellectual and our æsthetic nature, so also our moral nature, calls for the existence of God, and completes our idea of his nature. All the efforts of philosophers to account for moral obligation without resorting to the idea of God, have only resulted in showing the vanity of such an attempt.

Thus it appears that human nature involves a threefold postulate of the existence of God. The laws of thought force us to the affirmation of a perfect Being, the source, cause, and end of all things. The æsthetic nature demands a Being perfectly admirable, the source of all beauty. But the moral nature suggests the contents of their perfection and of their beauty. The ideal of thought, the ideal of æsthetics, and the ideal of the conscience, form but one and the same ideal. All phenomenal reality, all reality of man and the world would remain utterly inexplicable, all knowledge would be impossible, if this ideal were not itself the inevitable reality.

The First Cause of all existence and of our own is also the author of the moral law; the absolute substance is a personal will. *He* whose moral law enjoins upon us to love each other, loves us himself, since the obeying of this law would involve and realize the satisfaction of all our wants. This love is the only key to the mystery of our existence. In imitating this love, we merge ourselves into absolute order, and thus realize absolute unity and the absolute life.

Thus the last word of ethics is identical with the last word of logic and the last word of æsthetics. All three sciences, when developed consequentially, ultimate inevitably in unity, and postulate that this unity be that of a concrete, absolute personality.



## VI.—THE WANT OF SUCCESS IN THE WORK OF CONVERSION.

EXPERIENCE is a great teacher; and he who will not learn from it can never be wise. It is a very comprehensive word, embracing, as it does, all that is learned by practice. It is restricted not to one person, but extends to all, as all are experimenting on something. In one view, the true history of the world is the world's experience; and he who tells it, "tells a great experience." All that is *practically* known of religion, politics, arts, and sciences, is the result of experience on these subjects. Experience is a matter of fact—not of theory. Experimental and theoretic knowledge are as different from each other as are theory and practice. The experience of the world consists of all the knowledge acquired by the world by experiment, or trial; the experience of any class or body of people is made up of all the knowledge which it has acquired in the same way; \*and the experience of an individual is the amount of all that he knows by experiment.

These statements are made to prepare the way for something on the subject of the experience of Christians in their efforts to convert the world. In some respects, it has been glorious; in others, sad. That many have been converted, is undoubtedly true. But few, *comparatively*, have turned to God; this is sad. Such a result was not contemplated in the establishment of the Church of Christ. How many children of Christians, in this country, have died the death of the sinner—not "the death of the righteous"—since the first settlements of Europeans on this continent! How many are now living in open disobedience to God! Religious considerations brought many of our ancestors to this country of savages, expecting here to develop the true Church of Christ, and to lead it on to its glorious destiny. Neither of these objects has been attained. Partial success, only, can be claimed. To some extent, liturgical service has been abandoned, and the worship of God "in spirit and in truth" has taken its place. Some success in the development of the spiritual power of the Church has been manifested in the conversion

of people to God. But the worship has not been as spiritual as it should be; nor have the conversions been as numerous. We intend now to speak more particularly of the latter.

At the rate we have progressed thus far, the world, or this part of it, will never be converted. The proportion outside of the kingdom of God, in this country, is probably greater than at the formation of the early settlements in the same localities, and throughout the whole country. Either the meal or the leaven is deficient, or the latter has not been put into the former. The whole mass is far from being leavened. But the meal is the same—unconverted people. Why has it not been leavened? or, why has not the mass of people in this country turned to God? The genuine leaven has not been put into the meal. Speculative doctrines have been taught, and not the facts and obedience of the Gospel.

The *theory of conversion* has occupied more attention, taken up more time, cost more money, and made to occupy a more prominent place, than all the facts of the Gospel. This theory is purely a metaphysical thing, and was never taught either by Jesus or his apostles. The Gospel is not a theory. It is news—*good news*. If, the popular theory of conversion is ever so correct, it is not worth preaching; for it never converts any one. But "the law of the Lord is perfect, converting the soul; the testimony of the Lord is pure, making wise the simple." Therefore the command to "*preach the Word*"—not the theory.

The distinctive doctrines of the different denominations are theoretic; and all these bodies are, distinctively, theoretic bodies—not practical. Theoretic preaching, if it makes any converts at all, makes only theoretic converts; and such converts make only a theoretic Church; and a theoretic Church results in theoretic worship. Hence all the theoretic prayers, theoretic exhortations, and theoretic praise, so common in our country. Zeal for theories is not zeal for the Gospel, zeal for the salvation of men, nor for the glory of God. For, as we have already said, the Gospel is not a theory, but it is good news. Nor is the salvation of men a theory; much less, if possible, is the glory of God a theory. Men can not be saved by believing a theory of salvation, converted by believing a theory of conversion, sanctified by believing a theory of sanctification, nor glorified by believing a theory of glorification. There is

nothing saving, converting, sanctifying, nor glorifying, in any theory however correct in itself. To enjoy these things, a person must be, something more than a correct and zealous theorist.

Preach the kingdom of God ; preach the Gospel ; preach the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins ; preach the things concerning the kingdom of God, and the name of Jesus Christ ; preach the Word of the Lord ; preach Christ ; preach the Word. These are the things to be preached, and the things to be believed and obeyed. It is this belief and this obedience that saves sinners, through the sacrifice of our Great High-priest, who has entered into heaven, now to appear in the presence of God for us.

Preaching is both public and private. Jesus and the apostles preached to the multitudes and to individuals—in synagogues and from house to house, both by day and by night, as opportunity presented. Private Christians preached privately, both men and women. In the persecution, all were scattered abroad except the apostles ; “and they who were scattered abroad went every-where, preaching the Word.” Preaching and teaching were the means of salvation depended on in primitive times. “It pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save those who believed.” The preached Gospel was “the power of God in order to salvation to every one who believed, to the Jews first and also to the Greeks.”

Religion is a matter of education. This has been so from the beginning. God taught Abel, Noah, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Moses and the prophets, Jesus and the apostles. When he gave his law to his people, he said : “Only take heed to thyself, and keep thy soul diligently, lest thou forget the things which thine eyes have seen, and lest they depart from thy heart all the days of thy life : but teach them to thy sons, and thy sons’ sons.” “And these words which I command thee this day, shall be in thine heart, and thou shalt teach them diligently unto thy children, and shalt talk of them when thou sittest in thy house, and when thou walkest by the way, and when thou liest down, and when thou risest up.” This is God’s method of salvation. First teach the parents, in the beginning of a dispensation, and then require them to teach the same things to their children, and even their grandchildren. “Fathers provoke not your children to anger, but bring them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord.” This is the way God has ordained to convert

children. The Greek word (*ἐκτρέφω*) means, *to nourish, promote health and strength, to bring up, educate*. "In the [*παιδεία* from *παιδεύω*, *to instruct, educate, discipline*,] nurture" means, in discipline, including both knowledge and practice. The Lord has a discipline. In this, parents are commanded to educate their children, and also in the admonition of the Lord. Children become Christians, not by any "ordinance administered to them," nor by any "dedication" or "consecration of them" in infancy. They must be *educated* in the discipline and admonition of the Lord. They must be "*made wise unto salvation*," Timothy had known the Holy Scriptures "from a child," and Paul said that they were able to make him "wise unto salvation, through the faith in Christ Jesus."

To bring children up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord, is to educate, or to teach them the Gospel—its facts, its commands, its promises; and to educate them in the admonition, or warning, of the Lord, is to teach them the threatenings of the Lord, as announced in the Gospel. "He who believes, and is baptized, shall be saved; and he who believes not shall be condemned."

Children should be taught to believe the Gospel and to repent of their sins. This can be done at an earlier period than many suppose. It is easier to do it at ten years old than at twenty. The heart is softer, and the attractions and temptations of the world fewer in earlier life. No one believes the Gospel more firmly, or repents of sins more sincerely, than a properly cared-for child of ten years old. When educated up to this point, children should not be told that they are too young to be baptized for remission of their sins, of which they have repented; but they should be baptized, and be added to the Church and taken care of as "the little ones" who believe in Jesus. No child is too young to be baptized and added to the Church, who is not too young to believe and repent. And no child is old enough to be baptized who is not old enough to believe and repent. Repentance and belief are always put before baptism. There is no more propriety in teaching that a person should wait till the Holy Spirit converts him before he is baptized and added to the Church, than there is in teaching him that he must not believe the Gospel, or repent of his sins, before such conversion, and that he must carefully abstain from keeping all God's laws till he is thus converted. And if it is wrong for him to believe the Gospel before

his heart is supernaturally changed, the minister and his parents should be careful not to let the child hear it, lest he should commit the awful sin of believing it, and add to it the great sin of repentance, and to that the greater sin of being baptized for the remission of the sins of which he has so unorthodoxly repented!

We are *blaming* no one for errors of this kind; for God knows that if we have not been brought up on the Bank of Newfoundland, we have all been born and reared in the fog, as were our lamented parents before us. It is a long time back to the apostolic times, and "dark ages" have intervened. But it is now "day-spring," or morning twilight, and we are beginning to see some things obscurely, and hope yet to see all things clearly.

We say, then, that one great cause of the want of success in the work of conversion consists in the fact *that Christians have neglected the proper training of their children*. Instead of teaching and bringing them into the kingdom of heaven, the school of Jesus and the home of his little ones, we have "rebuked them," and have forgotten that he said: "Suffer the little children, and forbid them not, to come to me, for to such belongs the kingdom of heaven." The Roman Catholics know much better how to make Catholics than we do how to make disciples of Jesus.

*Let the Pedobaptists desist from baptizing infants, and let all Baptists cease to "forbid little children," who should be taught to come to Jesus.* The baptism of infants has been one great cause of shutting the kingdom of God against little ones who believe in Jesus. That practice is so absurd, and so utterly unscriptural, that it has driven Baptists into the opposite extreme.

If our Protestant Fathers, who settled this continent with civilized people, had thrown denominationalism and infant sprinkling overboard when on their way here, and had planted the Church of Christ on the rock, and properly educated their children in the discipline and admonition of the Lord, and had suffered "the little children to come" to him, we would now be a strong nation, able to oppose successfully the flood of infidelity which is setting in from Europe, instead of being like a ship in a storm at sea, with a good chart and compass, but a divided and insubordinate crew, led on by factionists, neither of whom can man the helm. O, that the voice of the Master could be heard, crying, "Peace, be still!"

When religion shall be regarded as a matter of *education*, both as respects the intellect and the emotions, and parents and teachers shall do their whole duty to children, the force of our faith will be demonstrated, and the truth will triumph.

One must have read the New Testament inattentively not to have noticed the fact that nearly the whole of the First Epistle of John was written to "little children," as distinguished from "young men" and "fathers," and that they are there recognized as disciples of Christ.

It does not appear to whom the first chapter of this Epistle is addressed until we arrive at the beginning of the second, where it is written, "My little children, these things I write to you." From the twelfth to the seventeenth verses, both included, he addresses "little children," "fathers," and "young men." He then resumes his address to the "little children," and continues it to the end of the Epistle, by frequent mention of them as the persons addressed; and then closes it by saying: "Little children, keep yourselves from the idols."

The style of this Epistle, when it is considered to whom it was particularly addressed, is inimitable. In all the addresses to children, to which I have had the pleasure to listen, I never heard any thing like it; and I have heard many *good* and many *better* addresses; but this is *the best* of all. The style is, in every way, suitable to a man of great age, information, and extensive experience, and an apostle of Christ; and while treating on things spiritual, it is sublimely pious and elevated, yet adapted to the capacities of "little children." It was evidently designed for them. A great apostle, while his mind dwelt on loftiest themes, was translating his thoughts, clearly and forcibly, into the language of pious "little children." It is the coalescence of sublimity and simplicity.

The Second Epistle was not written to "the elect lady" alone; but "to her children" also. And the apostle says, "I rejoiced greatly, that I found of thy children walking in truth, as we received commandment of the Father." Nor does he fail to notice the fact that "the children of" her "elect sister" saluted her. Children, and even "little children," were very conspicuous among the disciples in these early times; and still later, in the times of fiery persecution, they went boldly through the streets, after seeing their elder brethren burn at the stake, and cried out, "We also are Christians," as if they



coveted the flames, and desired, literally, to ascend to heaven in a chariot of fire! Was ever faith stronger? Were ever better "subjects" baptized? "*Parents, provoke not your children to anger, but bring them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord.*" Teach them, baptize them, and add them to the Church. However much you may oppose "infant baptism," do not fear to baptize "little children" who know the Lord.

---

## VII.—THE TRUE FOUNDATION.

THE disciples of Jesus, when regarded as an organized community, are called "God's building." Every well-constructed building has a good foundation. Paul and Sosthenes were God's fellow-laborers in the construction of his edifice. The materials were the members of the Church in Corinth, those sanctified in Christ Jesus, called to be saints, *with all that in every place call on the name of Jesus Christ our Lord.* Paul, as a wise master-builder, laid the foundation, and others built on it, because "other foundation can no one lay than that which is laid, which is Jesus Christ"—not Simon Peter. There is no other foundation for God's building. For other buildings, other foundations can be laid. The Church of Rome and the Mohammedans have other foundations. Of the first, Peter is claimed as the foundation; of the second, Mohammed.

But when it is said that Jesus Christ is the foundation of the Church—God's building—it is not to be understood in a literal sense. The Church is not literally a building, but it is a community contemplated in the light of a building, a house in which God dwells; a spiritual house built up of spiritual stones, or living stones, as a "habitation of God, through the Spirit."

Christ is said to be the foundation of this house, because it is built on the confession that he is "the Christ, the Son of the living God." These are the admitted facts on which the community of his disciples is founded. Every one (and no others) was received

as a member of the Church of God, who confessed him before men. There was no infant membership in his Church. None were admitted but those who were born again; none but those who received him, who believed in his name, "who were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God;" and who were "born, not of perishable seed, but of imperishable, through the Word of God, which lives and abides forever." Such as had "purified their souls in obeying the truth to unfeigned brotherly love" were the material of which the Church of God, or the building of God, was constructed.

Neither Moses nor Abraham was the foundation of the Church of Christ. Some in the time of Christ said, "We are Moses' disciples;" but they were not received on that confession. Others said, "We have Abraham for a father;" but they were commanded to banish that thought. They could not be received on that confession. "No other foundation can any one lay than that which is laid, which is Jesus Christ."

"He inquired of his disciples, Who do men say that the Son of man is? And they said, Some John, the immerser; and others, Elijah; and others, Jeremiah, or one of the prophets. And he says to them, But who do ye say that I am? And Simon Peter answering, said, Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God. And Jesus answering, said to him, Happy art thou, Simon, son of Jonah; for flesh and blood did not reveal it to thee, but my Father who is in heaven. And also to thee I say, that thou art Peter (*Πετρος*) and on (*ταύτῃ τῇ πέτρᾳ*) this rock I will build my Church, and the gates of (*ᾅδου*) hades shall not prevail against it. And I will give to thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven; and whatever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven; and whatever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven."

It is of importance to notice, here, the fact that the question is, "*Who* do ye say that I am?" not, "*What* do ye say that I am?" Peter answers this question by, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God." To this Jesus responds, "Happy art thou, Simon, son of Jonah; for flesh and blood did not reveal it to thee, but my Father who is in heaven." You did not discover this yourself. You are Peter, and nothing more. You obtained this truth from my Father. And I now say that I will build my Church on this rock

(πέτρα). On what rock? Surely not on Peter; for that is masculine, and *petra* (rock) is feminine. And ταύτη (this) is not *thou*, for it is a relative, and not a personal pronoun; and it also is feminine. It is also the third person, and *thee* is second person. Why this change in gender, number, and person, if he intended to say that he would build his Church on Peter?

But it is said that Peter means *stone*. *Not in the New Testament*. It occurs about one hundred and sixty times, and *only as the name of a person*. *Lithos* (λίθος) is the New Testament name for stone. When a word becomes a proper name, which is the case with *Petros* (Peter), and is used as such, it does not retain its original signification. Who thinks, when he hears the word Isaac, of *joy* or *laughter*? And yet that is the original meaning of Isaac. And who thinks, when he hears the word Simon or Simeon, of *hearing* or *obeying*. He who does, must think of a *hearing* or *obeying* stone, when he hears the name of Simon Peter; for such were the meanings of these words before they were used as proper names, but never when they are used as such.

This apostle is called six times by his Syriac name (Κηφᾶς) Cephas—once, John i, 43—and the evangelist says that that name, “interpreted” or translated into Greek, is Πέτρος (Peter)—not, as in the common version, “a stone.” For *Petros* and *Cephas* are here both used as proper names. All the evangelist intended to say was, simply, that *Cephas* and *Peter* were two names in two different languages, and that they were equivalents; and, as such, were applied to the same person. Suppose a man writing English should say that there was a man sent from God, whose name was *Iōannees*, which, interpreted, was *John*. Would any person think of saying, *Whose name was the grace-gift, or mercy, of the Lord*, simply because that was the meaning of the word when not used as a proper name? We repeat that *Petros* never means *stone* in the New Testament, although used a hundred and sixty times in that book.

If John had intended to say that *Cephas*, interpreted, was *stone*, he would have used *lithos*, and not *petros*.

Although *petros*, when not used as a proper name, meant a stone, a piece of a rock, the highest lexicographical authority says that it is not the equivalent of *petra* (rock), on which Jesus said he would build his Church. *Petra* (rock), when used of the sea-shore, means a ledge,

or shelf of rock; and there is no example in good authors of *petra*, in the signification of *petros*, for a single stone."

In all the following expressions, *petra*, and not *Petros* (Peter), is used: "Built on rock;" "founded on rock;" "on this rock I will build;" "the rocks rent;" "which he had hewn out of rock;" "had hewn out in rock;" "laid the foundation in rock;" "it was founded on rock;" "some fell on rock;" "they on the rock;" "rock of offense;" "the spiritual rock that followed them;" "that rock was Christ;" "said to the rocks, Fall on us." These are all the places in the New Testament where *petra* occurs. *PETRA (rock) is never used as a proper name, and PETROS is always so used in the New Testament.* Who, then, can affirm that, when Jesus said he would build his Church on *petra*, he meant that he would build it on *Petros* (Peter)?

Further: if Peter understood that he was the foundation of the Church, he would have claimed that honor. There was a dispute among the disciples, at one time, as to which of them was the greater. Jesus knowing it, "he called the twelve and says to them, If any one desires to be first, he shall be last of all, and servant of all." And when "the *thought* arose in them, which of them was greatest, Jesus perceiving the thought of their heart, took a child and placed it by him, and said to them, Whoever shall receive this child in my name, receives me; and whoever shall receive me, receives him who sent me; for he who is least among you all, the same is great." The very thought of primacy was rebuked.

But "there arose a contention among them," not only who was the greatest, but "which of them should be accounted the greatest." This ambition was checked by authority. The question of primacy was here fairly raised; and this was after Jesus had said, "On this rock I will build my Church." If by "rock" he meant Peter, neither he nor any other apostle knew it; for if they had, that question of superiority could not have been raised among them, it being already settled in Peter's favor. And if they had forgotten the fact that the primacy was awarded to Peter, Jesus would have said that that question was settled, that he had told them that he would build his Church on Peter, and therefore there was no room left for discussion. But no such intimation is given. He told them that they should all sit on thrones, and judge the twelve tribes of Israel,—thus placing them on a level. (Luke xxii, 24-30.)

Paul says that James, Cephas (Peter), and John "were reputed to be pillars." These three men, who gave to Paul and Barnabas "the right-hand of fellowship that they should go to the Gentiles," while these pillars went "to the circumcision," are placed on a level as "pillars;" but neither of them is regarded as the foundation; for "other foundation can no one lay than that which is laid, which is Jesus Christ." If Peter had been what some claim for him, Paul would have said that Cephas was reputed the foundation, and James and John pillars. But to him no pre-eminence is given.

But why should Jesus speak *to* Peter as the second person, and *of* the rock as the third person, if by rock he meant Peter? And why tell him that he was the foundation of the Church, and, in the same breath, that he gave to him the keys of the kingdom of heaven? Why this confusion of figures? The keys of the kingdom are not given to the foundation. The design of a foundation is not that of keeping keys, but of support to the edifice built thereon. Such rhetoric does not become "a teacher come from God." It is very poor freshman rhetoric.

It has been supposed that *Petros* (Peter) suggested the name "rock," for the truth which he had just confessed. But whence this inference? As a proper name it had no significance. It was merely distinctive. Jesus did not say, "Thou art *stone*;" for he was not stone, but "flesh and blood," like other men; none of whom had revealed the great truth to him. In saying, "Thou art Peter," he affirms that he is only a man—not the Christ, not the Son of the living God; but simply a man, who could not have attained the true knowledge of him but by a revelation from the Father in heaven. But notwithstanding he was only a man, who was known as Peter, he was happy because God had revealed to him a great truth, which was to be the foundation on which he would build his Church. It was the idea of *building*, and not Peter, that suggested a "rock." He who had said that a wise man "*built his house on (petra) rock*," "*laid the foundation on rock*," and that the house "fell not, because it was *founded on rock*," also said he would *build* his Church on rock, and the gates of hades should not prevail against it. *Petra*, and not *Petros* (Peter), was used as that on which man built. *Petros* is not used in that sense, and therefore could not suggest that thought.

In cases where reference is made to the original meaning of a  
VOL. VI.—7

word which has become a proper name, that fact is indicated; as, "Thou shalt call his name Jesus [Savior]; for he shall save his people from their sins;" and, "They shall call his name Immanuel, which is interpreted, God with us." The angel told Elizabeth that she should call her child, when born, John; and no reference is made to the meaning of that word when not used as a proper name, nor is any reason assigned for that preference. Not so in the two cases above cited; nor in the case of Peter when Jesus gave him that name: "And he goes up into the mountain, and calls to him whom he would: and they went to him. And he appointed twelve, that they should be with him, and that he might send them forth to preach, and to have authority to cure sicknesses, and to drive out demons: and Simon he surnamed Peter; and James the son of Zebedee, and John the brother of James; and he surnamed them *Boanerges*, which is, *Sons of thunder*." (Mark iii, 13-17.)

Here is a case where a name is given with direct reference to its meaning; and that fact is apparent to all. He called them *Boanerges*, which is, *Sons of thunder*. But he surnamed Simon *Petros* (Peter), not *stone*; for no reference is made to the first use of the word. Let it be remembered that neither Peter nor Cephas is used in the sense of stone, in the New Testament. Nor could any one ever learn that either of them had ever been used in that sense, from that volume. Nor is *petra* (rock) ever used, in that book, in the sense of Peter, or Cephas. Such a thing is nowhere intimated in the things which are written of Jesus and the apostles. With reference to these writings, that thought is illegitimate; and the doctrine founded on it, relative to the foundation of Christ's Church, is extra-Scriptural, and anti-apostolical.

The Church of Christ is built on the truth confessed by Peter, who received it by revelation from the Father: "THOU ART THE CHRIST, THE SON OF THE LIVING GOD." All men who believed, and confessed this truth—and no others—were admitted into his Church; not by virtue of any fleshly relation, but because they were "born again, not of perishable, but of imperishable seed, through the Word of God, which lives and abides forever." Neither the claim that they were "Moses' disciples," nor that they had "Abraham for father," availed any thing. They could gain admittance to this Church only by the adoption and confession of the great Messianic truth. This



was, emphatically, *the Confession of Faith*, without the adoption of which there was no promise of salvation, and by the rejection of which condemnation was threatened. All other summaries of religious belief are as vanity compared with this. It presents Jesus—not in person, but in character and in office—as the foundation of a new community, called God's house or building; a temple which he inhabits through the Spirit. Paul, who preached Christ in Corinth first, laid the foundation, and another built thereon.

With him and his fellow-workers and coadjutors, "Jesus is the Christ, the Son of the living God," was the only foundation of the Church of God, the faith of God's elect, which was once delivered to the saints, and the basis or protoplasm of all spiritual life. This truth revolutionized the world, and converted the temples of idols into houses for the worship of the living God. It worked its way among all classes, from the poorest up to Cæsar's household. It was the truth for all the nations, and for all generations. "The frozen Iceland and the sunburned Moor" were alike the objects of its search and salvation. It knew no national boundaries, no castes, no civil conditions, but looked upon the world as a sinful and pitiable mass of fallen humanity, and asked the poor to become rich, the slaves to become God's freemen, and the wealthy to accept the true riches. It invited to the most holy and universal unity, discarding all distinctions of barbarian, Scythian, bond and free; and bid male and female to accept the first and only offer of a free salvation to an entire world. It proposed to all, life and salvation, immortality and eternal life, as its hope, and commenced its hymn of praise with, "Glory to God in the highest heaven, and on earth peace and good will to men;" and closed with, "Great and marvelous are thy works, Lord God, the Almighty; just and true are thy ways, thou King of the nations. Who shall not fear, O Lord, and glorify thy name? Because thou alone art holy; because all the nations shall come and worship before thee; because thy judgments are made manifest."

This glorious truth is worthy of all acceptance. The gates of hades shall never prevail against it, nor against the Church built thereon. When all the feuds of the sects, the uninspired creeds of the denominations, the cavils of undevout scientists, and these heavens and this earth shall pass away, this truth will still remain the TRUE FOUNDATION, unimpaired, glorious, and eternal.

## LITERARY NOTICES.

## HOME LITERATURE.

## BOOKS.

- 1.—*The Pentateuch in Its Progressive Revelations of God to Men.* Designed for both Pastors and People. By Rev. HENRY COWLES, D. D. New York: D. Appleton & Co. Cincinnati: Robert Clarke & Co. 1874. 12mo. pp. 414.

It is difficult to overestimate the value of a thorough knowledge of the Pentateuch. These five books furnish the real battle-ground between science and revelation and infidelity and Christianity. The origin of man, his antediluvian history, his subsequent development under the patriarchs, and the final establishment and typical import of the Jewish institution, form a class of subjects of the deepest significance, and of the greatest interest to every student of history and friend of religion.

It has not been long since the study of Geology awakened a new interest in the study of Genesis; and, now, the Darwinian theory of the origin of man is bringing theologians and scientists again together upon the ancient battle-field.

But the importance of the Pentateuch is chiefly owing to its connection with the New Testament. To be sure that we understand Christ, we must carefully study Moses; and to obtain a clear conception of the nature of the Christian religion, we must first become acquainted with the types and shadows, laws and ceremonies, as revealed and expounded in the Pentateuch. In fact, it is doubtful whether any one can ever understand the genius of Christianity without first becoming very thoroughly acquainted with the origin and development of the Jewish theocracy.

Entertaining this view of the importance of the Pentateuch, we heartily welcome every earnest effort to throw light upon this portion of God's Word. We are particularly pleased with Dr. Cowles's effort. His is not a Commentary in the ordinary form. It discusses topically such matters as are of the greatest importance. In this way, a mass of uninteresting matters are passed over, while the great questions with which the world is at present concerned are discussed with clearness and ability. While the conclusions arrived at may not always be satisfactory, it will scarcely

escape the reader's attention that the author has convictions of his own, and is not afraid to state them. He speaks right out the faith that is in him; and, as he generally treats his opponents fairly, he always commands respect, though we may fail to be converted by his arguments.

Some of the discussions are intensely interesting. The review of Darwinism is very brief, but is as conclusive as a volume would be. It is doubtful whether this development theory has ever been more successfully handled or more satisfactorily refuted. The argument is, indeed, a *multum in parvo*, and deserves to be ranked among the very best of its kind.

A very ingenious chapter is on the Hebrew Chronology. But it is, in our judgment, more ingenious than conclusive. We have already two or three score of chronological systems, and something can be said in favor of every one of these. Surely, it is useless to hope that any thing like order will ever come out of this chronological muddle. It is well that our salvation does not depend upon dates.

The doctor is evidently confused a little on the Sabbath and the Covenants; but we suppose it unreasonable to hope for any thing else from a man occupying his religious stand-point. Nor is he entirely free from criticism when he comes to consider the moral law as given from Sinai. Here, again, we see the influence of his theological system, which, despite his evident honesty, frequently gets the better of him.

One of the most interesting portions of the volume is that which treats of God's providence in dealing with the children of Israel during their sojourn in Egypt and subsequent deliverance by the hand of Moses. The following, concerning the purposes of God in locating the birth of the Hebrew nation in the land of Egypt, is given as a specimen of the author's style:

"Since God's purposes never come to naught, but are always accomplished perfectly, the ends he has in view being surely secured, it is safe to reason backward from known results to original purposes. It would amount, practically, to the same thing, if we were to ask, What great results were actually secured by locating his people in Egypt when and as he did, by shaping their history as he did, and by bringing them out at length with his high hand and outstretched arm?

"1. In answering these questions, we may note that Egypt stood at the summit of the world's civilization, a fully organized kingdom, a great and highly cultured people. There is most ample proof that Egypt was then eminent above any other nation in learning, wisdom, science, and art; in jurisprudence and in the administration of law; in industry and in wealth; in short, in all the main appliances and results of a high civilization. The antiquities of ancient Egypt are the marvel of our times. Her temples, pyramids, and obelisks, her paintings and her works of art, have come down to our age in most wonderful preservation, living witnesses to her ancient greatness. There was no other kingdom on the face of the earth where a man like Moses could have been educated and trained to become the lawgiver of the Hebrew nation, or where such a system of civil law as God gave his people by the hand of Moses could have taken its rise, and could have been understood, accepted, appreciated, and ultimately wrought into established usage and into the national life. We shall have occasion, in its place, to inquire

how far the civil system given through Moses was borrowed from the Egyptian Code; and, consequently, how far the scenes of their Egyptian life prepared the way for the new national life instituted in the wilderness.

"2. The plan of transferring his people from their nomadic, pastoral life in Canaan, to a settled residence in Egypt, provided scope for all those developments which we have been studying in the history of Jacob, Joseph, and his brethren.

"3. Yet more and greater developments of God's mighty hand were provided for in the deliverance of his people from their bondage in Egypt; in his judgments on Pharaoh and his land; in the destruction of his hosts in the Red Sea; in the wilderness life of Israel during forty years; and, at length, in their location in the land of promise. All these points will come under review in their order."

We give another specimen, concerning the hardening of Pharaoh's heart. This matter has been a little troublesome to commentators, and we give the beginning and conclusion of Dr. Cowles's explanation, not because we fully agree with him, but because it presents a point or two with great clearness and force:

"The point of chief interest is the moral one, that which locates the moral responsibility for the hardening of Pharaoh's heart; that which defines and places truthfully the really responsible agency in the case. Was this hardening the work of God, by his immediate hand? Was it wrought by his power so exclusively and in such modes as to overrule and throw out of account Pharaoh's own responsible agency? Or was the responsible agency that of Pharaoh only, altogether his, and his alone? Did he harden his own heart, in the exercise of his own free will in carrying out the purpose and desire of his own soul, essentially as other sinners and as all sinners do? This question is one of immensely vital moment. Let us approach it with both care and candor. We may reach the true answer by studying: (1.) The history of the case; (2.) What is said of God's purpose in this matter; (3.) What he has taught us of his character, and of his agencies in the existence of sin.

"(1.) The history of the transaction will doubtless throw light on the question, How came Pharaoh's heart to be hardened? *How was it done?* The history of the transaction, developing the steps of the process, bears more vitally upon the question, Who is responsible? than may at first view be realized. For, let it be carefully considered, God's ways of working by his immediate, direct, exclusive agency, will forever be mysterious and inscrutable to us. It is idle for us to ask, How does God work a miracle? Of course, it must be idle for us to inquire after the natural law of such working, because the very idea of a miracle is that of a work *not* wrought according to any known law of nature. If, now, the hardening of Pharaoh's heart were wrought by God's miraculous, direct, immediate hand, we shall look in vain for the law of his operations. It would be simply preposterous to inquire after the laws of mind in accordance with which the thing was done, the supposition being that it was done according to no known laws of mind whatever.

"On the other hand, if Pharaoh hardened his own heart, there will be no mystery about it. It so happens that we all know too well how sinners harden their own hearts. There is rarely the least difficulty in tracing the operations of the human mind and the influences of temptation which produce this result. Therefore, if the history of the hardening of Pharaoh's heart brings out the working of his mind, according to the common modes of human sinning; if we see that his mind worked as the minds of other proud sinners are wont to work under like circumstances, then the whole question is settled at once and forever. If we can actually *see* how Pharaoh hardened his own heart, and can identify the whole process as being the very same which occurs in the case of all proud sinners who resist God's power and mercy, what more can we ask? It were worse than idle, it were impious, to exonerate Pharaoh from the least portion of the moral responsibility for his hardened heart, and to seek to cast it over upon God.

"In entering upon the *history of the case*, it is well to note the attitude of Pharaoh's mind toward the God of Israel in the outset. We have it brought out fully (Ex. v, 1, 2): 'Moses and Aaron went in and told Pharaoh: Thus saith the Lord God of Israel, Let my people go, that they may serve me.' And Pharaoh said, 'Who is the Lord that I should obey his voice, to let Israel go? I know not the Lord, neither will I let Israel go.' This is plain. He says he does not know this God; he does not recognize his authority, or admit his claims. His soul is full of practical unbelief in God—a fact which commonly lies at the bottom of all the hardening of sinners' hearts in every age. Pharaoh did not at first contemplate crossing swords and measuring arms *with the Almighty God*. If he had taken this view of the case, he might have paused awhile to consider. So it usually is with sinners. Unbelief in God conduces to launch them upon this terrible conflict. Once committed, they become more hardened; one sin leads on to more sinning, till sin becomes incurable—shall we say it?—an uncontrollable madness."

Our author now proceeds to give attention to each particular case, taking them up in order, noting the effect of each on Pharaoh's heart. He then concludes as follows:

"We proceed to notice what is said of *God's purpose* in the hardening of Pharaoh's heart. It is the more important to speak of this, because an extreme view is sometimes taken of the central passage (Ex. ix, 14-16): 'And, in very deed, for this cause have I raised thee up for to show in thee my power,' etc. The extreme view referred to is, that God made Pharaoh a great king, put him on a high throne, for the avowed purpose of displaying his own great power in his sin and punishment.

"By consent of Hebrew lexicographers, the verb translated *raised up* means, in this case, *preserved alive*—have caused thee to stand, or continue among the living. The previous context, moreover, seems not to be quite accurately put in our English version. It should rather be thus, beginning with verse 14: 'For at this very time I am sending [present time] all my plagues to thine heart, and upon thy people, that thou mayest know that there is none like me in all the earth. For I might now have stretched out my hand and smitten thee and thy people with pestilence [that is, might have smitten you all dead], and thou wouldst have been cut off from the earth. But, truly, for this very reason have I preserved thee alive, to the end that thou mightest show forth [make others see] my power, and for the sake of proclaiming my name in all the earth.' To the same purport are the words (Ex. xiv, 17-18,) with reference to the final destruction of Pharaoh's host: 'And I will get me honor upon Pharaoh and upon all his host, etc. And the Egyptians shall know that I am the Lord, when I shall have gotten me honor upon Pharaoh and upon his chariot and his horsemen.' The great thought is, that God turns to account the sin and madness of Pharaoh, for the purpose of making known his power to save his people and to crush their foes. He shapes his ways of providence to this end. He might have swept off Pharaoh and his people with the same pestilence which devoured so many of their cattle; but he had a wiser purpose. He could make a better use of their sin and of their life; so he spared them till he had wrought all his wonders upon Egypt before all the nations of the earth; and then he let them plunge into the mighty waves of the Red Sea, and made their grave there! Now, if wicked men *will sin*, who shall object against God that he makes the best possible use of it? Why may he not reveal his power thereby, and exalt his name as one 'mighty to save' or to destroy?

"It only remains to ask, What has God taught us of his character as bearing on the question before us, and of his agencies in the existence of sin? Here, few words ought to suffice. Nothing can be more plain than the revelations of Scripture concerning God's character as infinitely pure and holy; as a being who not only can never sin himself, but can never be pleased to have others sin; and, above all, can never put forth his power to *make them sin*. God can not be tempted with evil, '*neither tempteth he any man*.' (James i, 13.) When he declares so solemnly and so tenderly, 'O, do not that abominable thing which I hate!' shall it still be said, But he puts men to sinning; pushes them on in

their sin; inclines their heart to sin, and hardens them to more and guiltier sinning? Never! Shall it be claimed that with one hand God gives his Spirit to impress the truth on human souls unto their salvation, and with the other sends his Spirit to augment the forces of temptation, and to harden men's hearts unto their damnation? Shall the same fountain send forth both sweet water and bitter? Shall the same God renew some human hearts unto holiness, and harden other human hearts in sin—all by the same direct and similarly purposed agency, each work being done under the same impulses of infinite love? Surely, there must be some egregious misconception of God's character involved in supposing him capable of acts so fundamentally opposite and incompatible—not to say, in supposing him capable of tempting men into more and greater sin! The fact that he wisely and mightily overrules sin to bring good forth from it should never be construed to imply that he abhors sin any the less because he can extort some good results from its existence."

Seldom, indeed, have we examined a work that promises to give more substantial benefit to the preacher and people than this one. It is not weighed down with erudition, and yet there is no lack of learning to meet the necessities of every case. The work is evidently not intended for those who wish to examine thoroughly the subjects discussed, and yet we think it is sufficiently exhaustive to meet the wants of most students.

---

2.—*The Study of Sociology.* By HERBERT SPENCER. New York: D. Appleton & Co. Cincinnati: Robert Clarke & Co. 1874. 12mo. pp. 423.

WHATEVER Mr. Spencer writes is sure to command attention. His vigorous intellect, extensive reading, and close observation, entitle what he says to a high degree of confidence. Then it is evident he has faith in his conclusions. He heartily believes in the doctrines he teaches; still, we doubt if his writings will ever produce the effect upon society which he anticipates. Certain results are sure to follow, but they are not such as he is endeavoring to bring about. The evil which he sees and exposes in society may be partially, at least, avoided in the future, but not likely by Mr. Spencer's method. When one is seriously sick, it does not require much medical skill to detect this fact; but it is altogether another thing to apply a successful remedy. Mr. Spencer sees many of the evils with which society is afflicted, and it yet remains to be seen whether he can furnish the panacea which is needed. In reaching the proper remedy, he also plainly perceives the defect in the reasoning of others, as the following extract will show:

"People who think that the relations between expenditures and production are so simple, naturally assume simplicity in other relations among social phenomena. Is there distress somewhere? They suppose nothing more is required than to subscribe money for relieving it. On the one hand, they never trace the reactive effects which charitable donations work on bank accounts, on the surplus capital bankers have to lend, on the productive activity which the capital now abstracted would have set up, on the number of laborers who would have received wages and who now go without wages. They do not perceive that certain neces-



saries of life have been withheld from one man who would have exchanged useful work for them, and given to another who perhaps persistently evades working. Nor, on the other hand, do they look beyond the immediate mitigation of misery. They deliberately shut their eyes to the fact that as fast as they increase the provision for those who live without labor, so fast do they increase the number of those who live without labor; and that with an ever-increasing outcry for more alms. Similarly throughout all their political thinking. Proximate causes and proximate results are alone contemplated. There is scarcely any consciousness that the original causes are often numerous and widely different from the apparent cause; and that beyond each immediate result there will be multitudinous remote results, most of them quite incalculable."

This is evidently a very truthful picture of an unfortunate state of things; and what is true here with respect to society in general, is equally true with each individual member of it. Nearly every man manages his affairs in very much the same way; and this fact, we think, gives us at least a key to many of the financial panics which are so common in this country.

Speaking of the same class, Mr. Spencer justly remarks:

"Minds in which the conceptions of social actions are thus rudimentary, are also minds ready to harbor wild hopes of benefits to be achieved by administrative agencies. In each such mind there seems to be the unexpressed postulate that every evil in a society admits of cure; and that the cure lies within the reach of law. 'Why is not there a better inspection of the mercantile marine?' asked a correspondent of the *Times* the other day: apparently forgetting that, within the preceding twelve months, the power he had invoked had lost two of its own vessels, and barely saved a third. 'Ugly buildings are eye-sores, and should not be allowed,' urges one who is anxious for æsthetic culture. Meanwhile, from the agent which is to foster good taste, there have come monuments and public buildings of which the less said the better; and its chosen design for the Law Courts meets with almost universal condemnation. Why did those in authority allow such defective sanitary arrangements? was every-where asked, after the fevers at Lord Lonsborough's; and this question you heard repeated, regardless of the fact that sanitary arrangements having such results in this and other cases, were themselves the outcome of appointed sanitary administrations—regardless of the fact that the authorized system had itself been the means of introducing foul gases into houses. 'The State should purchase the railways,' is confidently asserted by those who, every morning, read of chaos at the Admiralty, or cross-purposes in the dockyards, or wretched army organization, or diplomatic bungling that endangers peace, or frustration of justice by technicalities and costs and delays,—all without having their confidence in officialism shaken. 'Building acts should insure better ventilation in small houses,' says one who either never knew or has forgotten that, after Messrs. Reid and Barry had spent £200,000 in failing to ventilate the Houses of Parliament, the First Commissioner of Works proposed that the House should get some competent engineer, above suspicion of partiality, to let them see what ought to be done. And, similarly, there are continually cropping out, in the press and at meetings and in conversations, such notions as that the State might provide 'cheap capital' by some financial sleight-of-hand; that there ought to be bread overseers appointed by government; that it is the duty of government to provide a suitable national asylum for the reception of all illegitimate children.' And here it is doubtless thought by some, as it is in France by M. de Lagevenais, that government, by supplying good music, should exclude the bad, such as that of Offenbach. We smile on reading of that French princess, celebrated for her innocent wonder that people should starve when there was so simple a remedy. But why should we smile? A great part of the current political thought evinces notions of practicability not much more rational."

What is here said ought to cause enlightened statesmen to think. It may be that we are not far from the time when it will be conceded that

government ought no longer to provide for the misfortunes, or any other evils of mankind. Some men have already begun to regard poverty as a crime, to be punished, rather than to be helped by charitable provision. We do not know how far this view may prevail; but of one thing we are assured, that, should it become general, it is not likely to work greater evil to society than our present beneficiary system. While certain philanthropists are clamorous for governmental aid in providing for the paupers and other supposed objects of charity, it might be well to consider the way in which Mr. Spencer puts the matter. He says:

"When there arises the question, Why does not government do this for us? there is not the accompanying thought, Why does not government put its hands in our pockets, and, with the proceeds, pay officials to do this, instead of leaving us to do it ourselves? But the accompanying thought is, Why does not government, out of its inexhaustible resources, yield us this benefit?"

Mr. Spencer frankly admits the difficulties in the way of a social science. He devotes several chapters to the consideration of these. This discussion is characterized by a very sharp analysis of men and things, and is full of suggestive points and practical deductions. Much of what he says, however, shows that he is a better doubter than any thing else. He is never so strong as when he is engaged in a tilt against established institutions. As an iconoclast, he is worthy to take the lead; and it is really delightful to witness some of his assaults upon some of the gods of popular favor.

But he is not satisfied with presenting the difficulties of the social science; he proposes the discipline necessary to overcome these difficulties. Here is a sample of what is to be done:

"By cultivation of the abstract, concrete sciences, there is produced a further habit of thought, not otherwise produced, which is essential to right-thinking in general; and, by implication, to right-thinking in sociology. Familiarity with the various orders of physical and chemical phenomena gives distinctness and strength to the consciousness of *cause and effect*."

This is the first means of discipline suggested by which the people are to be prepared for the incoming millennium of the new society. But did it ever occur to Mr. Spencer that only a small proportion of the great masses can ever receive any real benefit from such proposed training, for the simple reason that such training, except in comparatively a few cases, is simply impracticable? And if we are to reach the new society through such a training of the whole people, it may be, after all of Mr. Spencer's slurs upon religionists, that there is more hope of the near approach of the theological millennium than for his.

Then he gives us a chapter on "Preparation in Biology;" and we all know that Mr. Spencer is at home on this subject. The following gives the key to this chapter:

"Fostering the good-for-nothing at the expense of the good, is an extreme cruelty. It is a deliberate storing up of miseries for future generations. There is no greater curse to

posterity than that of bequeathing them an increasing population of imbeciles and idlers and criminals. To aid the bad in multiplying is, in effect, the same as maliciously providing for our descendants a multitude of enemies. It may be doubted whether the maudlin philanthropy which, looking only at direct mitigations, persistently ignores indirect mischiefs, does not inflict a greater total of misery than the extremest selfishness inflicts. Refusing to consider the remote influences of his incontinent generosity, the thoughtless giver stands but a degree above the drunkard, who thinks only of to-day's pleasure and ignores to-morrow's pain; or the spendthrift, who seeks immediate delights at the cost of ultimate poverty. In one respect, indeed, he is worse; since, while getting the present pleasure produced in giving pleasure, he leaves the future miseries to be borne by others, escaping them himself. And calling for still stronger reprobation is that scattering of money, prompted by misinterpretation of the saying that 'Charity covers a multitude of sins.' For in the many whom this misinterpretation leads to believe that by large donations they can compound for evil deeds, we may trace an element of positive baseness, an effort to get a good place in another world, no matter at what injury to fellow-creatures."

Is it not more than hinted in Mr. Spencer's philosophy, that about the best thing that can be done with unfortunate people, is to knock them in the head, and thereby get rid of them at once, as a public nuisance? But we suppose he means that no such unfortunates shall ever come into existence when we shall have fully entered upon the millennium of scientific glory.

"Preparation in Psychology," is another chapter, suggesting the kind of discipline necessary for the new era. Of course, Mr. Spencer is not satisfied with the present aspect of mental science; and, for all that, we might ask, Who is? Mental philosophers are no nearer together now than they were in the times of Plato and Aristotle. And it is by no means certain that the point of harmony will be reached here any sooner than in theology.

Mr. Spencer does not fairly reach what the title of his book implies. One would suppose that he intended to give us his system of sociology. But not so, except as he had done this incidentally. His views can be distinctly gathered, but we have no classified science as yet. His Principles of Sociology are to follow, in three volumes. It is not fair to anticipate what the effect of this publication will be. But, judging of the future by the past, it is not difficult to determine that Mr. Spencer's theories are practical moonshine; and his new social era a mere dream, which will never be realized. Spencerism will likely have its run, as all other isms of this kind have had. The people of America have yet too distinctly in view the failure of the New Harmony project, under the leadership of Robert Owen, and the various communities of New York and the New England States, to be easily captured by the glittering generalities of Mr. Spencer's plausible theorizing.

Every few years a new phase of Fourierism is presented to the world. And we suppose that, in some way, this is necessary; for these experiments are made to convince the world that the Church of Jesus Christ is the only community in which it is possible to meet the necessary wants of human

society. When that Church shall be what it ought to be, it will then appear that nothing else is needed in order to the development of a true civilization.

- 3.—*History of Philosophy.* From Thales to the Present Time. By Dr. FRIEDRICH UEBERWEG, late Professor of Philosophy in the University of Königsberg. Translated from the fourth German edition, by GEORGE S. MORRIS, A. M., Professor of Modern Languages in the University of Michigan, and Associate of the Victoria Institute, London. Vol. II.—History of Modern Philosophy, with additions by the Translators. An Appendix on English and American Philosophy. By NOAH PORTER, D. D., LL. D., President of Yale College. And an Appendix on Italian Philosophy. By VICENZO POTTA, Ph. D., late Professor of Philosophy in the University of Turin. New York: Scribner, Armstrong & Co. Cincinnati: George E. Stevens & Co. 8vo. 1874. pp 561.

It can not be denied that the various phases of speculative philosophy present an interesting field for study. Much of this philosophy may be nothing more than a sort of intellectual gymnastics; nevertheless it gives us a fine illustration of the powers of the human mind, as well as the struggles of that mind after some trustworthy data, from which to start in its reasonings. Doubtless much harm has been done by the dogmas of metaphysics. It is with a sad heart that we read of how these dogmas have taken the place of facts, and how speculative opinion has been substituted for that faith that overcomes the world.

If philosophy could be held to its own sphere, then little or no harm could come of it. The same may be said of natural science. Both of these have their place in the development of our race. But the men who engage in the study of these, are not willing to confine themselves to their legitimate positions, but are constantly coming over on the ground of religion, and are seeking to interfere with the faith and practice of religious people. Now, these same scientists and philosophers are exceedingly clamorous against the dogmatic style of theologians, and we are not disposed to question the fairness of their criticism. But we submit that the old proverb, "They that live in glass houses should not throw stones," ought not to be forgotten by these iconoclastic warriors. For we do not know a more unreasonable set of men—men who meddle more decidedly with other people's business, and who are more offensively dogmatic in the defense of their theories—than that very class who are forever antagonizing the dogmas of theology. You can scarcely take up a book on any scientific subject without finding a chapter or two devoted to religion; while in every chapter you will find more or less of pure assertion concerning the Church and its ministry. Now, both theologians and scientists should understand that their respective subjects are very different in their character, and can not, therefore, be discussed from the same stand-point. Religion is wholly a

matter of faith, and has its facts and data from revelation. It is therefore removed entirely from the philosophic and scientific sphere into the region of faith. The very moment it is brought down and subjected to the tests of science or philosophy, that moment does it lose its distinctive character, and become worthless in its power to regenerate the world.

But, as before stated, philosophy has its proper sphere, and is certainly useful when confined to this sphere. Hence, an impartial history of philosophy is not only needed, but will do much to place the whole subject in a proper light before the mind. Such a work, we think, is this of Dr. Ueberweg's.

We have already commended the first volume; and we can just as heartily commend the present one. In fact, this volume is much more important to the theologian and Christian than the former one, as it treats of Modern Philosophy, or "Philosophy since the discontinuance of its condition of subserviency to theology, in its gradual development into an independent science; having for its subject the essence and laws of nature and mind, as enriched and deepened by prior growths, and exerting an influence upon contemporaneous investigations in positive science and upon social life, and being in turn reacted upon by these. Its chief divisions are: 1. The Transitional Period, beginning with the Renewal of Platonism; 2. The Epoch of Empiricism, Dogmatism, and Skepticism, from Bacon and Descartes, to the Encyclopædists and Hume; and, 3. The Epoch of the Kantian Criticism, and of the systems issuing from it, from Kant to the present time." It will be readily seen that this presents one of the most interesting periods of speculative inquiry, and, as modern theology has been seriously affected by philosophic discussions, it is important to see in what way this has been brought about. And we have only carefully to read the volume before us in order to possess this desirable information.

In the additions to Ueberweg's work by President Porter, America presents quite an array of names who have become known as writers of Philosophy. Jonathan Edwards stands first in the list, and is considered the greatest of all. We do not find fault with this opinion; though there are other names mentioned, whose claims to the classification given them are, to say the least, very doubtful; while a number of names are omitted entirely, that should have had a place in the work.

The chapter on Italian Philosophy is exceedingly interesting, and adds much to the value of the book. The whole is followed by a copious Index to both volumes.

We heartily commend this work as, in our judgment, altogether the best history of Philosophy in any language. It is well conducted, and the arrangement is very convenient. It is, in a word, just what every student of Philosophy needs.

- 4.—*Foods*. By EDWARD SMITH, M. D., LL. B., F. R. S., Fellow of the Royal College of Physicians of London, Corresponding Member of the Académie des Sciences, Montpellier, and of the Natural History Society of Montreal, etc. New York: D. Appleton & Co. Cincinnati: Robert Clarke & Co. 1873. 12mo. pp. 485.

WE are glad that we at last have a truly scientific work on "Foods." Almost innumerable attempts have been made to say something intelligibly upon this important subject; but, until the present volume, we have seen nothing that is at all trustworthy. Now, however, we have a book that is the result of careful and scientific investigation. Facts, instead of theories, are given, while diagrams, wood-cuts, and tables serve to bring every thing within the comprehension of the general reader. Surely, such a work as this is very desirable. There is no subject which the American people, especially, need to study more carefully than the relation of food to health. Our modes of living ought to be thoroughly investigated, and such reformation pointed out as will help us to a more vigorous physical development than our civilization now promises. We are slaves to business, and have little respect for our nervous systems; hence, it is not difficult to see that the average age of the American people must become less and less, without some very radical change in our manner of living.

We can derive much help from the careful study of such a book as the one before us; and we would be glad to see it not only in the hands of every mother, but thoroughly studied, especially by them, and its suggestions made the basis of a more intelligent management in the culinary department of every household. We give below what our author says concerning the apparent effects of coffee and tea upon the human system:

"Coffee, like tea, is a powerful respiratory excitant, and has a crystallized nitrogenous element called caffeine, very analogous to theine, upon which this action depends. A large series of experiments on the respiratory functions were made by me on this substance, as on tea. Of twenty-three experiments on myself and others, there was from half an ounce of coffee an increase in the quantity of carbonic acid evolved of 0.98, 1.02, 0.9, 0.4, 1.16, and 2.54 grains per minute, at different times; while the quantity of air inspired was increased 40.34, 35, and 84 cubic inches per minute, with the same experiments. Three-quarters of an ounce of coffee did not give a greater increase; but the actual increase was 0.68, and 1.68 grains of carbonic acid and 28 and 54 cubic inches of air, per minute. There was, however, this difference in the effect of coffee and tea, that the former caused an increased rate of respiration; so that the depth of inspiration was but slightly increased, and there was an increase in the rate of pulsation.

"There is also another difference in the action of these allied substances; namely, that coffee does not increase the vaporizing action of the skin, but decreases it; and therefore dries that organ. I pointed out, long ago, that while both tea and coffee agree in increasing the respiratory changes, tea, by increasing the action of the skin, lessens the force of the circulation, cools the body, and does not cause congestion of any of the mucous membranes, and particularly that of the bowels; while coffee, by diminishing the action of the skin, lessens also the loss of heat of the body, but increases the *vis a tergo*, and therefore the heart's action and the fullness of the pulse, and excites the mucous membranes. In one of our experiments, after having taken an infusion made from two



ounces of coffee, we fell to the floor and remained unconscious for some minutes; the result, as was subsequently shown, of a very large quantity of fluid having been thrown into the intestines, by which the volume of the blood in circulation was suddenly reduced.

"The conditions, therefore, under which coffee may be taken are very different from those suited to tea. It is more fitted than tea for the poor and feeble. It is, also, more fitted for breakfast, inasmuch as the skin is then active, and the heart's action feeble; while in good health, and with sufficient food, it is not needful after dinner; but if then drank, should be taken soon after the meal. Hence, in certain respects, tea and coffee are antidotes of each other, and we know that they are not taken indiscriminately, although in a chief action they are interchangeable.

"Coffee also has been said to lessen metamorphosis of animal tissues, because the emission of urea was lessened; but this implies that urea is a measure of tissue change, which can not now be supported by facts. This introduces one of the most interesting discoveries of the day, in which my own researches have led the way, by showing that the emission of carbonic acid by the lungs is the true measure of muscular exertion. I proved in my paper, in the 'Philosophical Transactions for 1859,' that even the movement of the hand could be measured by that standard; while, in my paper in the 'Philosophical Transactions for 1862,' I showed that the violent exertion of the tread-wheel caused scarcely an appreciable increase in the emission of urea, and supported the results simultaneously obtained by Bischof and Voit in experiments on dogs.

"The discussion of this subject will be more fittingly pursued in the work on 'Dietaries;' and I shall here be content with simply indicating the change of basis on which the estimation of muscular waste must now be made. Coffee is an excitant of the nervous system, but not in the same degree as tea. It produces sleeplessness in many persons when it is taken at night, probably by exciting the heart's action, and preventing that fall which is natural at night, and requisite to permit sound sleep. I do not think that there is the same degree of reaction after taking strong coffee as follows strong tea. It is needless to add, that none of these effects may be marked if the effusion be very weak, as is common among the poor; and, in this respect, it resembles very weak tea.

"Strong coffee is a valuable antidote in poisoning by opium; and may be used as a corrective of the action of tea in persons whose skin is very active. The addition of milk, which is so universal, forms a more perfect food with coffee than with tea, for both the former have the same kind of action on the skin and respiration, and, therefore, aid each other, while milk counteracts, in a degree, the action of tea upon the skin."

The chapter on "Alcohols" is especially valuable, and is the most sensible discussion on this subject we have seen; while what is said upon ventilation deserves the serious consideration of every one who wishes to enjoy good health. We quote the general directions, which are as follows:

"1. Inhabited rooms should, if possible, have external walls on two sides, so that air may be admitted through both.

"2. The openings should be small and many, rather than few and large, defended by perforated zinc, and placed as distant as possible from those who inhabit the room. Hence, the cornice above and the skirting below are convenient positions; but rooms of less than ten feet in height are not easily ventilated without draughts. The connection between the inside and the outside of a room should not be direct, but at an angle, so that a direct current may not be produced.

"3. Such ventilators as direct the current to the ceiling are useful in a degree; but the cold air thus admitted will descend before the air is warmed.

"4. Channels which are divided by a perpendicular diaphragm, on the theory that there will be an ascending current in one and a descending current in the other, are, for the most part, based on a fallacy; and when the heat of the air is very great, there will be an upward and a downward current in both.

"5. An air-flue by the side of the chimney-flue, into which the exit-tubes lead, will act,

in some degree, so long as there is fire in the chimney, to rarify the air; but if an Archimedian screw be placed at the top of such a flue, it will induce an upward current when there is no fire, provided there be wind to move it. This apparatus may be attached to any air-flue placed in any position.

"6. The use of the chimney-flue as an exit for the air is liable to allow the smoke to enter the room through it when there is a down draught, notwithstanding the excellent contrivances which have been devised to prevent the return current.

"7. Whenever it is proposed to remove air, means for supplying a larger quantity of air should be provided, or the attempt at ventilation will be ineffectual.

"8. It is often desirable to warm as much of the air which is admitted, as possible; and for that purpose stoves have been designed with an exit from a special channel into the room. When the same object is affected by allowing cold air to enter by an opening through the wall, and then to direct it over heated pipes the distribution is less satisfactory; but such pipes should be heated with water, and not with steam of an uncertain temperature.

"9. Stoves which are placed in the middle of a room should be fed with wood and inclosed in an outer skin of metal or pottery. With coal and a furious fire, the air is not only dried to an injurious extent, but burned.

"10. It is more than doubtful whether, in our climate, or in any moist climate, the ordinary open fire-grate can be supplanted with advantage. It is otherwise in countries where the air is very cold and dry."

---

5.—*Daisy Dare, and Baby Power. Poems:* by ROSA VERTNER JEFFREY. With Light Illustrations. Designed by D. VERTNER JOHNSON, ESQ. Philadelphia: Claxton, Remsen, & Haffelfinger. 1871. 16mo. pp. 57.

THERE are at least two important elements, aside from real merit, that enter into the success of a book; one is the publisher, and the other the locality of the author. It is difficult to determine how much the publisher has to do with the success of a literary venture, but we know that it is very considerable. We know that many books that are simply worthless have a fair sale, just because they are brought before the public in a very business-like way by their publishers; and then we know again, that other books of real value fall still-born from the press, because their publishers have failed to put them upon the market in such a way as to command attention.

Then there is a sort of specialty in the publication of books that must be recognized. By general consent, certain houses seem to have a monopoly of certain classes of books. For example, the Appleton's publish scientific works; Scribner's & Co., theological; the Harpers, historical travels, etc.; while Osgood & Co., of Boston, publish more poetry than all the rest together. This fact should be noted by authors, and such publishers sought for as have the best facilities for handling the particular kind of books to be published.

But the other element referred to is also of very great importance. There are certain classes of books which Western and Southern people may write with fair chances of success, such as works on Farming, Horticulture, etc.; and even an adventure in romance may sometimes hope to

meet with public recognition. But alas for the person who aspires to poetical honors, if he should hail from the West or South! We do not know why it is so; but for some reason, the East is supposed to be the only place in this country capable of producing poets. Hence it has almost passed into a proverb, "Can any thing poetically good come out of the West or South?"

We think the foregoing facts will explain, at least partially, the failure of the little volume before us, to meet with the success which it richly deserves. The book was published in Philadelphia, where no one looks for a book of poetry, and by a house whose specialty is Sunday-school books and Bible Dictionaries. Then, the author is a Southern lady, and can therefore never be recognized by our poetical critics, who think only of Boston as the center of poetical genius. Now, at the risk of incurring the displeasure of all our literary *savants*, we are prepared to affirm that the two poems, "Daisy Dare" and "Baby Power," are greatly superior to any thing Lucy Larcom, *et id genus omne*, ever wrote. And, in saying this, we do not wish to be understood as attempting to depreciate any body or any thing. We simply state what is our candid conviction, with a view to do justice to one whose merits have not been sufficiently recognized, without attempting to disparage one who has had fully as much recognition as she deserves. Had the little poem of "Baby Power" been published in the *Atlantic Monthly*, under the initials of some Eastern poet, it would have been copied and praised all over the land. If you want to sit easily upon your Pegasus, you must turn his face to the rising sun.

We do not claim for these poems any extraordinary power. "Daisy Dare" contains some exquisite passages; though, as a whole, it is somewhat defective in plot, and is not always happy in expression. Still the poem is greatly superior to many of greater pretensions which are bound in blue and gold, or else find place in volumes claiming to represent the "Female Poets of America." "Daisy Dare" is the same old story of love and jealousy. It vividly represents how a hasty word may cause a proud heart to "repent at leisure." Daisy quarrels with her lover because she thinks he is jealous of another; he goes to sea, she refusing

"To say farewell—to wave her hand."

After he is gone from her presence, she deeply repents of her conduct.

"She heard the steamship's iron bell;  
Turned to the shore; but faltered, fell—  
For ocean steamers do not wait  
On love—her pride gave way too late.

And now when, from that outward bound,  
Defiant distance brought no sound,  
She wandered hopeless to the strand,  
And, hopeless, westward waved her hand.

Too late! she heard it rise and swell,  
Tolled by the iron steamer's bell;  
Told by the mocking voice of Fate,  
Rung through her heart, 'Too late! too late!'

The steamer's black smoke, drifting far,  
Rose up and hid the evening star;  
A bitter symbol of that strife  
Between love's day-star and her life."

Soon the news comes back to her that "the ship went down" with only two or three saved, and

"Among them was not Graham Lee."

Now begins that fearful agony of heart which results from the consciousness of having seriously wronged the one whom she best loved.

"Thus tangled in a cruel fate,  
Dared through her folly, feared too late,  
The light of Daisy's lost love made  
The past fall back in deepest shade.

Strong natures suffer more than those  
Who, bowing down, parade their woes  
For a brief season, and then rise :  
The brave heart, uncomplaining, dies."

The story ends with the unexpected reappearance of Graham Lee, and his earnest proposal for reconciliation. The result of his plea is told in the following exquisitely beautiful lines :

"No blot on the horizon's verge,  
No black smoke hid the star ; no surge  
Came up to fret the silent sea ;  
No answer came to Graham Lee.

From noiseless waters, stealing slow,  
The drooping white stalactites glow ;  
From noiseless drops stalagmites rise :  
Silent they meet and crystallize.

What need of words ? From eye to eye  
How quick the magnet glances fly—  
Electric sparks from soul to soul—  
As magnets flash from pole to pole !

The overflowing loves that spring  
From two proud natures, meeting, cling  
In strong, pure bliss from heart to home,  
As cavern spars from floor to dome."

Mrs. Jeffrey has written considerable for Southern and Western papers and periodicals, some of her poems excelling even those to which we have called attention. Still she has not had that general recognition which she deserves. Hence, we have written this notice in order to contribute our mite toward helping a worthy woman in her struggles with the fate in which an unfortunate location and an unhappy selection of publishers have bound her. She is one of our Southern ladies, and we have a right to speak for her ; not in charity, but because she is worthy of a place among those writers of poetry whom fortune has more signally favored.

---

6.—*Literary and Social Judgments.* By W. R. GREG. Boston: James R. Osgood & Co. Cincinnati: Robert Clarke & Co. 1873. 12mo. pp. 352.

THIS is, in the truest sense, a readable book. In fact, it is thoroughly enjoyable. It is sketchy and chatty, and may be read from cover to cover, or only here and there, according to the mood or opportunity of the reader. It discusses the following subjects: Madame de Staël; British and Foreign Characteristics; False Morality of Lady Novelists; Kingsley and Carlyle; French Fiction: The Lowest Deep; Chateaubriand; M. de Tocqueville; Why are Women Redundant? Truth *versus* Edification; Time; Good People.

The sketch of Madame de Staël is well written, and presents the chief characteristics of that wonderful woman in a very strong light. "British

and Foreign Characteristics" are treated with intelligent discrimination, and many thoughts are suggested which we would do well to remember. The following has the true ring in it:

"Now, we are no advocates for a life of inaction and repose. Activity is better than stagnation; exertion in pursuit of any object is better than an existence with no object at all. We know well that out of dissatisfaction with our present condition have arisen all our successful conquests of higher and more desirable conditions; that to the restless energy and aspiring temper of the Anglo-Saxon may be traced a large proportion of the material progress, and not a little of the intellectual progress, of the world; that civilization, if it does not consist in perpetual advance, at least owes its origin and present perfection to perpetual endeavor. But we can not permit ourselves to regard the struggle to be rich as worthy of admiration for itself. We can not bring ourselves to regard the gallant and persevering energy which is devoted to 'getting on in life,' as consecrated to a high aim. We can not persuade ourselves at once, and without inquiry, as many do, to pronounce the life that enjoys as, *ipso facto* and *per se*, meaner than the life that toils. We mourn over energies wasted by misdirection, as well as over energies suffered to lie dormant and die out. The man who strives for a clear duty or a noble prize is, beyond question, a higher and worthier being than the man who glides through life in happy and innocent tranquillity; but we are by no means so sure that the man who, having a *competence*, spends years and strength and spirits and temper in striving for a *fortune*, has made a wiser or better choice than the man who, having a competence, sits down thankfully and contentedly to enjoy it with his family and friends. *To be able* to make the future and the distant predominate over the present, is unquestionably to have arisen in the scale of thinking beings; but it by no means follows that *whatever* is distant and future ought to predominate over what is present and at hand."

The false morality of lady novelists is a subject which gives Mr. Greg ample scope for some of the peculiarities of his mind. He shows himself to be well versed in the literature he discusses, as well as a fair critic in dealing with both the excellencies and defects of our lady writers. We think that most readers will appreciate the following:

"Once for all, on this subject of self-sacrifice, we would exhort sentimental and ethical romance-writers to clear and purify their fantastic and flatulent morality, and substitute healthy strength for morbid and unnatural excitement. The power of surrendering and renouncing the dearest hopes and happiness of life at the clear command of duty, whether that duty be religious, political, or linked with the affections, is the divinest of human faculties, and its exercise is the sublimest spectacle that can be witnessed on this earth; but to make this sacrifice to family pride, to the world's breath, to the wrong passions or the shallow prejudices of others, is a spurious and histrionic counterfeit. It is building an altar to a false god; it is endowing with your dearest wealth the shrine of a mistaken faith; it is enthroning and worshiping a weakness which, however amiable and unselfish, is a weakness still. And when, as in almost all these instances is the case, the sacrifice made involves the happiness of another person as well as our own, and entails, as usually happens, deception practiced on a third, the deed becomes a cruelty as well as a mistake. And, considering the tendency so prevalent among all moralists and scrupulous and sincere minds, to imagine a course of conduct to be especially virtuous, simply because it is especially difficult and painful, and the probability, therefore, that these heroic sacrifices of ourselves and others will generally be made in those moods of exaggerated generosity and feverish enthusiasm, which are always dangerous, often artificial, and almost inevitably transient, it is especially incumbent on all who venture to paint such scenes and describe the feelings they excite, to beware lest they confound and misapply the fundamental principles of duty and justice, and lead those who desire to be guided by them to mistake idolatry

for piety, and rush into misery at the dictates of an unsound and inflated sentiment, when they fancy they are obeying the solemn voice of a Divine decree. Frequent errors on this subject bring discredit on the grandest virtue possible to man. We ought to be able to admire, not only the courage of social martyrs, but their wisdom likewise, and not be perpetually condemned to the demoralizing task of lamenting that the power of acting right should be so often divorced from the faculty of seeing straight."

Mr. Greg is certainly very rough on French fiction. There is doubtless much truth in what he says in the following paragraph:

"It is hard to say whether the current politics or the current literature of France conveys the more vivid impression of utter and profound demoralization,—the willing servitude, the craven fear, the thirsty materialism, the absence of all liberal sentiment or noble aspiration, indicated by the one; the abandonment of all self-control or self-respect, the surrender of all manliness, dignity, or reticence, the hunger after the most diseased, unholy, and extravagant excitement, characteristic of the other; or the intense and unrebuked selfishness, the passionate and slavish worship of wealth and power, which constitute the basis and the soul of both alike. Of course, there are exceptions in literature as in life. But we speak of the prevalent, the almost universal tone; we speak of the acting, voting, deciding, characterizing mass in the one case, and of the books of the widest circulation, and the writers of the most popular repute and the most signal success, in the other."

It is not difficult to see how out of this condition of things should come that instability of government that characterizes the French nation. The literature of a people is always an important factor in determining the morality, and morality is an essential condition to the permanency of good government. And, as the literature of the French has run so low, we can not hope for much improvement in their social condition until there is a reformation in the character of the books produced.

Mr. Greg has given us a chapter which Americans would do well to study. Already do we find a vicious class of books pandering to a depraved popular taste, and we are sorry to say that some publishers are too ready to give these books circulation, because of the pecuniary consideration involved. We have wholesome laws concerning the publication of obscene books, but we need protection against a class of books that do not come within the provision of any existing statutes. There are books sold in every respectable bookstore in the land, whose influence is much more fatal to good morals than any thing our present laws condemn.

---

7.—*Church Architecture.* Plans, Elevations, and Views of Twenty-one Churches and Two School-houses, Photolithographed from Original Drawings. By FREDERICK CLARKE WITHERS. Plates, LI, with Letterpress. New York: A. J. Bicknell & Co. 1873.

NEXT to the house in which we live, the house in which we worship should command our attention, with regard to architecture and the arrangements for comfort and health. Generally very little common sense is exercised in the construction of our church-buildings. Many of them seem to



have been built for show rather than for usefulness. Then again, where utility has been at all considered, frequently appearance has been entirely sacrificed. Now, we believe it is possible to harmonize a beautiful architecture with all the conditions necessary to health and comfort, and this is just what is needed in the construction of our church-buildings. We do not hope for any very rapid reformation on this subject. We know how hard it is to break through established customs. But we feel constrained to enter our protest against the building of houses for worship in which poisoned lungs is sure to be the cost of breathing, and a broken voice the result of any effort to speak so as to be heard. Then there are many other things against which we enter our solemn protest, such as pulpits, and especially when removed so far from the people as to destroy all possibility of sympathy between the speaker and those addressed.

But this is not all. Churches should be constructed with a view to the most obvious wants of such buildings. Every house should be arranged with the proper apartments, such as Sunday-school rooms, committee and prayer-meeting rooms, library, and pastor's study, etc. But these are the very things that are generally overlooked; and yet nothing could be more important in a well-arranged church-building.

The work which Mr. Withers has given us will do much good in many ways. The illustrations are prefaced with some eighteen pages of letter-press, interspersed with wood-cuts of arrangements of plans, constructions, doors, window-jambs, roofs, fonts, finials, seatings, stained glass, windows, etc. In fact, every thing is explained and illustrated so fully, that almost any one can form an intelligent idea of what is needed in the erection of a suitable church-edifice.

The following in relation to style is deserving of very careful attention :

"The style of every building should be so characteristic that a glance may be able to decide the purpose to which it is devoted. The graceful spire or less pretentious bellcot will, when rightly designed, be found to require no other interpreter. There is no style so admirably adapted to all wants and requirements as that of the mediæval Gothic, since it is one which can be made to accommodate itself to every necessity, whether of site or material; and it is therefore taken as a general standard for the designs which are contained in this book. This style, when rightly conceived, admits of no deceit or sham of any kind, and will not permit any attempt to disguise a necessary feature or allow any false construction. And herein may be said to lie one of its most important characteristics, as contradistinguished from any other architectural style—that it decorates construction, erecting only where required that which is essential, and then clothing it in the most lovely and pleasing form; whilst other styles, such as the Grecian or Roman, construct decoration by repeating features, not because they are required, but in order that the two sides of a building should be symmetrical. It has been customary, for example, to attempt to disguise the chimney in every possible way, either by putting it out of sight or concealing it in a hip-knob or pinnacle—in fact, ignoring its existence. But, as in this climate it is absolutely essential that our churches should be artificially heated, no attempt should be made to hide so necessary an adjunct of a warming apparatus; and, that it need not be a disfigurement, the reader is referred to most of the designs, where chimneys in the right position relative to the furnaces will be found."

Again, he makes some sensible remarks with regard to the seatings:

"Doors should never be used, as they are useless and inconvenient. . . . Not less than twenty inches in width should be allowed for each adult, so that a seat to hold six persons should be ten feet long, and so in proportion. . . . The most suitable material is oak, the color of black-walnut being rather too dark. Chestnut is also good. If common pine is used, it should be stained with a little burned sienna. When hard woods are used, they should be well oiled and dry-rubbed, but never varnished."

There are many very practical suggestions throughout the work; and, while we are not prepared to adopt every thing recommended, it is certain that Mr. Withers's book ought, in the main, to produce a healthful influence upon our future church architecture. Should even half that is valuable in it be adopted, we should be willing to forgive any deficiencies that remain, for the sake of the vast improvement that would then be accomplished.

---

8.—*The Liberal Education of the Nineteenth Century.* By Professor WILLIAM P. ATKINSON, of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. (Reprinted from the Popular Science Monthly, November, 1873.) New York: D. Appleton & Co. Pamphlet. pp. 28.

THIS pamphlet discusses a most important question. There are many phases of our educational problem not yet solved. We have been experimenting in several directions with not very satisfactory results. And it is by no means certain that we are now much nearer a correct understanding of the whole subject than we were many years ago.

Professor Atkinson begins where nearly every writer does, with a definition. But this definition is by no means as luminous as we have a right to expect from one who assumes to discuss so important a subject. He says:

"A liberal education is that education which makes a man an intellectual freeman, as opposed to that which makes a man a tool, an instrument for the accomplishment of some ulterior aim or object."

All this is very clear when we can once see it; but the seeing of it is a somewhat difficult matter. After we have fully mastered this definition, we are prepared for the following:

"I reckon five leading influences which are acting powerfully to modify all our old theories, and slowly working out a new ideal of liberal education: 1. A truer psychology, giving us for the first time a true theory of elementary teaching. 2. Progress in the science of philology, enabling us to assign their right position to the classical languages as elements in liberal culture, and giving us, in modern philological science, an improved and more powerful teaching instrument. 3. The first real attempt to combine republican ideas with the theory of liberal education. In other words, to make the education of the whole people liberal, instead of merely the education of certain privileged classes and protected professions. And when I say the whole people, I mean *men and women*. Nothing, I will say in passing, to my mind, so marks us as still educational barbarians, so stamps all our boasted culture with illiberality, as an exclusion of the other sex from all share in its privileges. No education can be truly liberal which is not equally applicable to one sex as to the other. 4. As the influence more profoundly modifying our conceptions of liberal edu-

cation than any other, I reckon the advent of modern physical science. 5. I count among those influences the growing perception that art and æsthetic culture are equally necessary as an element in all education worthy of the name."

The professor now devotes considerable attention to each of these influences. His remarks are frequently very suggestive, and sometimes even eloquent, in bidding farewell to the old and ushering in the new. Of course, the study of the classics, according to the old style, is severely reprobated, while the advent of modern physical science is likely to produce the greatest influence on the education of the future. The following will show that we do not overstate the professor's conception :

"I come now to the study of physical science as, from this time forward, destined to play a wholly new part in our system of liberal education. Nowhere, save in that very astonishing document, the Syllabus of his Holiness, Pope Pius IX, can any education philosophy be found so benighted as not to recognize its value and importance. Yet I am far from believing that its true place, as a factor in the new education, has yet been determined. While, on the one hand, among the old, high-and-dry advocates of the grindstone system, certain merits and a subordinate place are beginning to be grudgingly allowed it, we are in danger, on the other hand, in this new country of ours, whose vast material resources are waiting for development through its instrumentality, rather of overrating than underrating its pure educational function. It is not as an economical instrument for the development of material wealth that I have here to deal with it, though that is a very important aspect, but considered as a factor in a system of education ; and, as such, I claim for it no monopoly, but only a place as the indispensable complement to those ethical and linguistic studies which have heretofore monopolized the title of a liberal education, and which, from the absence of science from that form of education, have been reduced to their present effete and impotent condition. It is to the incorporation into it of the study of science that we are to look as the source of new life-blood.

We do not wish to undervalue, in any regard, the study of physical science. We sympathize with much that Professor Atkinson says. Still we respectfully suggest that the teachers of the new education are in danger of making a hobby of this matter. It may be that the advocates of the classical theory have made too much of the study of language, and too little of the study of physical science. Let us be careful, now, that we do not reverse this order, and thereby make modern education defective in some of the elements of a true development. Extremes beget extremes, is the lesson of all history ; and we have need to be careful, while passing away from the old theories of education, that we do not make the new equally as one-sided and objectionable. Let us have plenty of physical science, but we should be careful as to the amount of classical study we cut from our college curriculums.

---

9.—*The Arena and the Throne.* By L. T. TOWNSEND, D. D. Boston : Lee & Shepard. New York : Lee, Shepard & Dillingham. 1874. 16mo. pp. 264.

It is a fault of literary men that they write too much. They make one successful effort, and then they throw off books by the wholesale, until the

first thought is reproduced a thousand and one times. Thus we frequently have a really excellent literary effort administered to us in homeopathic doses through succeeding efforts, which are little more than dilutions of the first success. Very few authors have succeeded in writing more than one or two original works, and these have generally occupied several years in preparation. Dickens wrote "*Pickwick Papers*," and never surpassed these afterward, if, indeed, he ever wrote any thing their equal. Milton wrote "*Paradise Lost*," and, as "*Paradise Regained*" followed very soon, it is not remarkable that this last was comparatively a failure. Men may write an indifferent book, and afterward write a good one; but it is seldom, when once a real success has been achieved, that any thing very superior will follow.

All this leads us to say that, when Dr. Townsend finished "*Credo*," he ought to have rested for a while. That was a very creditable production. It grappled with some of the living issues of the present age, with a very vigorous style and a goodly array of facts and arguments. But the present volume is any thing but a success. It is full of unnatural conceits, and shows astonishing dullness in the treatment of scientific matters. The author evidently has in his mind a bold conception, but has failed to revolve it there sufficiently to be able to successfully present it to others. In other words, he has a theory of the universe and God's moral government which he has not well matured, and, attempting to give it to the world before it has incubated in his own mind, the result is precisely what we might reasonably expect.

In the first chapter he takes the ground that the earth is the only habitable portion of the known universe. In attempting to establish this hypothesis, sad havoc is made of many well-established facts, and a recklessness of statement is displayed which it is difficult to excuse in any one, and especially one who speaks so confidently.

The second chapter treats of the power of sin in luring, misleading, and destroying the human character. Judas is taken as an illustration. There is a good deal of forcible writing in this chapter; and while there are many things far-fetched, and some that are very doubtful, there is much to stimulate moral seriousness and earnest inquiry.

The third chapter shows the power and triumph of Divine grace. This is illustrated in the history of Job. The theology of this chapter is in many respects very doubtful, while it contains very little else that is worth remembering.

In the fourth chapter we have the doctrine presented that spiritual or glorified humanity is the form in which God incarnates himself, and is to reign in a glorified earth forever and ever. Man, in his present state, is Divinity in ruins, but when redeemed from sin and corruption, he is to be

Divinity enthroned. This view is not a new one, by any means, but is presented here in a somewhat original way. This portion of the book evinces considerable thought, and, though the author's meaning is sometimes a little obscure, the theory is rather ably presented, and will likely produce conviction of its truth in many minds.

---

10.—*Cross and Crown*; or, the Sufferings and Triumphs of the Heroic Men and Women who were persecuted for the Religion of Jesus Christ. By JAMES D. M'CABE, JR., with illustrations on steel by Sartain & Illman. National Publishing Company, Cincinnati, Ohio; Memphis, Tennessee; and Atlanta, Georgia. Jones Brothers & Co., Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; and Chicago, Illinois. 1874. 8vo. pp. 619.

A FAITHFUL history of the suffering people of God is one of the strongest evidences of the truth of Christianity. The Great Master did not fail to tell his disciples what would befall them on the earth. They were to have tribulation and sorrow and persecution; but all this was necessary to prepare them for that crown which he only is worthy to wear who overcometh.

In all ages of the Church the disciples of Christ have had trials. This is true of them even in this day of light and liberty. They are not tried in the same way as when men were called to go to the stake for Christ's sake, but they are tried nevertheless. It may not cost a man his life to stand up for the truth in this day, in the face of all the corruption and fearfully demoralizing influences; but, in order to do it successfully, it will require as much faith as that which characterized the martyrs of old, who died for the testimony of Jesus.

But it is interesting to go back over the past, and survey the fields of conflict on which have fallen so many noble heroes of the cross. There is an inspiration in this which nerves the heart for the conflicts of the present, and helps us properly to appreciate the blessings and privileges which we now enjoy. The volume before us will introduce us to the very facts of history with which we need to become acquainted in order to obtain the help to which we have referred.

The book does not pretend to be a history of the Church, nor even a history of the Reformation, to which period it is mainly devoted. It aims only "to call attention to the most vital principles of the Protestant cause, and to impress these principles on the mind of the reader by the relation of some of the most striking instances of Protestant martyrdom; and the instances given are those which are most likely to attract the general reader by the beauty and dramatic interest of the subject. The work is divided into three parts, each separate and complete in itself, and yet all bearing upon the main design of the volume. The story of the Vaudois Christians, the Huguenots, and the English Church, is first told, concisely

and as briefly as possible, so that in each case the narrations of individual martyrdoms may be the better understood by the reader."

We would be glad to see this work in every household. Its influence can not be otherwise than healthful. We do not sympathize with any alarm which the progress of the Roman Catholic Church may have occasioned. We are satisfied that the strength of Catholicism is greatly overrated, and that it is to be feared only because our politicians are not to be trusted. Still, "to be forewarned is to be forearmed." This volume will give our people an idea of what that hierarchy has done when it had the power, and will therefore put them on their guard against allowing encroachments upon their civil and religious rights.

The volume is intended for the people. It is a simple but truthful narrative of some of the men and scenes which have made the Protestant Church glorious, and the Roman Catholic Church odious, in the eyes of all lovers of political and religious liberty. The illustrations are excellent, and the book, as a whole, will be heartily welcomed in every family who properly appreciate the true, the beautiful, and the good.

---

11.—*What Can She Do?* By REV. E. P. ROE. New York: Dodd & Mead. Cincinnati: Robert Clarke & Co. 12mo. pp. 509.

THIS is a novel with a "moral," and such novels are generally worthless things. A great deal of infamous writing has to be waded through in order to reach the small amount of "pious instruction" which is stored away at the outcome. We do not mean to say that a novel may not have a purpose; but what we do say is, that no purpose, however exalted it may be in character, can compensate for a stupid rigmarole for a plot, and an intolerable dullness in the style which works it up.

What we want in a novel is fine delineation of character, broad generalization of important principles, and such a management of the whole machinery of the plot as to *interest* the reader, while it does not fail to *instruct* him. Other important auxiliaries might be mentioned, but this much can not be dispensed with.

"What Can She Do?" is an exception to the general rule with regard to novels of its class. It is cleverly written, and pictures certain phases of life with a realness which at once lifts its characters out of the region of fiction. It is a book that ought to be read, especially by young ladies of the boarding-school type—a class who have, as a general rule, very little idea of the character and self-reliance needed in order to become true and useful women in society.

The story told is very simple. It is one which may find its counterpart in very many families of the present time. A wealthy family becomes



impoverished. The women have learned only how to spend money. Alas! how frequently is this the only lesson! When the time of struggle comes, they are ill-prepared for the conflict. Three beautiful girls and a widowed mother are left to their own resources for a living. Poverty soon stares them in the face; and now, at the time of their greatest desperation, improper proposals are made to two of the daughters by a couple of "high larks" from the city. One of the girls accepts, and is ruined; the other rejects the infamous proposal, and becomes the savior of her family, and the rescuer of her lost sister.

During the recital of this story, there are many scenes and incidents introduced strikingly illustrative of fashionable life; and while we think here and there some pictures are overdrawn a little, and others again not as truthful as they might be, we can not help believing that the book, as a whole, will produce a healthy influence upon our civilization; and, believing thus, we heartily commend it to a place in every household.

---

12.—*Cyclopædia of Biblical, Theological, and Ecclesiastical Literature.* Prepared by the Rev. JOHN M'CLINTOCK, D. D., and JAMES STRONG, S. T. D. Vol. IV and V—H, I, J. New York: Harper & Bros. Cincinnati: Robert Clarke & Co. Royal 8vo. pp. 1122—958.

THESE two volumes bring the *Cyclopædia* down to M'Vickar; hence, we suppose that two or three more volumes will complete the work. There are many valuable works of this kind; but, for the purposes of the general student, we do not hesitate to pronounce this one, so far as published, the best in the English language. There is a vigor and freshness about its original articles which make them interesting reading, as well as valuable for the information they contain. Most *Cyclopædia* articles are dreary, dull, and dry, without the slightest tinge of that life which makes reading a pleasure. They are simply skeletonized facts, held together here and there by cold statistics, as sort of copulative conjunctions in this literature of the past. While the articles in this work are well condensed and entirely free from efforts at fine writing, still there is generally an ease and grace about the style that relieve the mind from the dreary monotony of mere facts and figures, and add considerable pleasure to the labor of digging out the information for which we are seeking. Then there is a range of subjects much wider than is usual for a work of this kind, while the more important subjects are treated with a fullness and thoroughness which leave little more to be said.

Since the death of Dr. M'Clintock, Professor J. H. Worman has become associated with Dr. Strong in the preparation of the work. It is very evident that the professor is the right man in the right place. His articles are all well written and many of them possess unusual merit. For

instance, his article on "Marriage" is one of the very best we have seen anywhere, presenting, as it does, an exhaustive review of the whole subject in comparatively very small space.

The book claims to be unsectarian in its character; and we believe that this claim, for the most part, is well sustained. Here and there, however, there are evidences of denominational bias, which we are sorry to see. Still, we suppose, this can not be entirely avoided, and we should therefore be thankful that the work is as catholic as it is.

- 
- 13.—*Secrets of the Convent and Confessional.* An Exhibition of the Influence and Workings of Papacy upon Society and Republican Institutions. By Mrs. JULIA M'NAIR WRIGHT. With an Introduction, by Rev. DANIEL MARCH, D. D. National Publishing Company, Cincinnati, O.; Memphis, Tenn.; Atlanta, Ga. Jones Bros. & Co., Philadelphia, Penn.; and Chicago, Ill. 1874.

THIS is a class of literature for which we have no very great respect. We know it is very popular with the people; but this is not positive evidence that it ought to be highly commended. People are always interested in secrets, and whatever proposes to reveal that which is mysterious will find considerable popular favor. In this country, at least, convents and confessionals are supposed to contain marvelous secrets. We do not say that they do not. We only say that any book which claims to uncover these secrets and expose them to the public view, will likely find readers, whether it is very truthful or not. Then it is not easy to test the truthfulness of what is related. Every thing must be received on faith, and sometimes our faith grows "small by degrees and beautifully less," as we continue to read these wonderful revelations.

We do not mean to say that Mrs. Wright's volume is unworthy of credit. Doubtless she is a most estimable lady, and means to do the fair thing; but we can not help the conviction that her antecedent associations do not particularly fit her for telling an "unvarnished tale." Still, if what she relates is half true, we need not look to the "Mother Church" for the best specimens of morality and virtue.

- 
- 14.—*The Luminary.* A Choice Collection of Anthems for Quartet and Chorus Choirs; adapted to Singing Societies, Musical Conventions, and Worshipping Assemblies. By J. P. POWELL. Cincinnati: Bosworth, Chase & Hall. 1873. pp. 128.

We regard this as one of the best anthem-books we have seen. The selections are all specially adapted to devotional exercises. It has been the aim of the author to make a book which may be used with profit in

the worship of the people of God. The author states that "no selection has been added which was written for the purpose of making a mere display of science in composition or skill in execution. Pieces for unusual occasions have been purposely omitted. It has been the aim to meet the wants of a well-organized choir of medium ability. The selections, with a few exceptions, are very nearly equally difficult; embracing specimens from about thirty-five of the most distinguished composers of anthems and chorals that ever lived; thus offering such a diversity of style in harmony, melody, and rhythmical structure, as can not fail to be most highly interesting to all lovers of sacred music."

We take pleasure in calling attention to these features, because they are the very things necessary to improve our Church music. The thin, frivolous music of our Sunday-schools is now exerting its influence upon the music in our Churches, and it is time that we should be called to something more stately, majestic, and soul-inspiring than much of the "hey-diddle-diddle" style of music which has become so popular. Give us again the grand old chorals and the swelling anthems that filled our fathers with delight, and filled their souls with a foretaste of heavenly music. These give us the inspiration of true worship, and lead us to the presence of Him who requires that we shall "worship him in spirit and in truth."

- 
- 15.—*The Undeveloped West; or, Five Years in the Territories.* Being a Complete History of that Vast Region between the Mississippi and the Pacific, its Resources, Climate, Inhabitants, Natural Curiosities, etc. Life and Adventure on Prairies, Mountains, and the Pacific Coast, with two hundred and forty illustrations from Original Sketches and Photographic Views of the Scenery, Cities, Lands, Mines, People, and Curiosities of the Great West. By J. H. BEADLE. National Publishing Company, Philadelphia, Penn.; Chicago, Ill.; Cincinnati, O.; St. Louis, Mo. 8vo. pp. 823.

THIS work not only presents a vivid picture of the vast extent and boundless resources of the Great West, but gives us a fine illustration of the pluck, energy, and intelligence of a Western man. Mr. Beadle spent five years in exploring the country about which he writes, and his narrative is largely made up of personal adventure. It is intensely interesting from beginning to end, many of its facts being altogether stranger than fiction.

Setting out on foot, Mr. Beadle traversed the States of Iowa, Minnesota, Nebraska, and Kansas (also, Dakota and the Indian Territory), becoming acquainted with the people, and making personal observations with regard to the topography and general resources of the country, gathering a fund of information which he now places before the reader in this interesting volume. He also visited the rich mines of Colorado, Utah, Nevada, and Idaho, the main portions of California and Oregon, and

spent considerable time in New Mexico, Arizona, and Texas. During these travels he became well acquainted with Indian life and character, as sometimes for weeks he saw not the face of a white man.

It is impossible to give any thing like an outline of the work in a notice of this kind, as it is chiefly made up of adventure and sight-seeing. But the book contains much valuable information, and, as it is written in an easy, off-hand style, and illustrated profusely, it ought to be very popular with the masses.

---

16.—*Songs of the Sunlands*. By JOAQUIN MILLER. Boston: Roberts Brothers. 1873.

MR. MILLER is evidently a waning poetical star. His first volume was a surprise to every body, and was, therefore, not subjected to a very severe critical ordeal. Still it can not be doubted that it possessed very superior merit. Its descriptions of scenery and wild life were so *real*, and yet so intensely romantic, that men almost held their breath, while reading, in wonder and admiration. But when that spell was broken, so many of Mr. Miller's faults as a poet came into view, that public sentiment was at last undecided as to whether a great star had arisen or not. No matter whether great or small, that star is now waning. The present volume contains many of the same characteristics as the first, but is far less interesting, and shows no improvement at the very points where Mr. Miller needed help. "Isles of the Amazons" is the longest and best poem in the book. The fable is of a Spanish adventurer who, deserting his countrymen at the time of the conquests, wanders away to the Amazon River. He is found by a Sisterhood, who take him for an Amazon of another color, and they adopt him into their tribe. Finally their islands are invaded by the neighboring men; and when each Amazon is thinking of taking to herself a mate from among the invaders, it is discovered that the queen has already become the Spaniard's bride.

This story is tediously told, and is loaded down with descriptions of tropical scenery and vegetation. One gets tired of so much luxury, and such constant exaggeration. After reading this story, the bleak, cold hills of Winter are a very welcome sight.

---

17.—*Popular Objections to Revealed Truth*. Lectures before the Christian Evidence Society. New York: A. D. F. Randolph & Co. 1873. 12mo. pp. 345.

THIS volume contains nothing that is original, and very little that is specially attractive. Some of the phases of popular infidelity are well met; though, for the most part, we think the treatment is not equal to the disease. Sighing over the eccentricities of skeptics will not do much toward removing

the difficulties which they present. We need a work upon the Evidences of Christianity which does not start out with a pledge to sustain the old theologies. We believe that one of the very best ways to disarm infidelity is to relieve Christianity of the burdens which it is now carrying, and which have been fastened upon it by the school-men of the Church. Give us the Christianity of the New Testament, pure and simple, and it will not be long before many of the popular objections which are now made will be numbered among the things that were.

Rationalism is not so much a protest against the Christ of history as it is against the Christ of theology, and its objections to the Christian religion have force mainly in the fact that it supposes modern Church-life to represent that religion. This, however, is far from being the case, and this fact ought to be made apparent in any attempt to deal with the skepticism of the present day.

- 
- 18.—*The Story of a Wonderful Life; or, Pen Pictures of the Most Interesting Incidents in the Life of the Celebrated John Wesley, adapted to the Tastes and the Wants of Young People.* By DANIEL WISE, D. D. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden. New York: Nelson & Phillips. 1874. 16mo. pp. 318.

THIS volume will be very acceptable as a condensed history of John Wesley. It deals in the most important matters connected with his remarkable life, and sketches, with apparent truthfulness, much that can not fail to be interesting and instructive to the general reader. It does not propose to be a Life of Wesley. For such a work the reader should look to the recent volumes of Mr. Tyerman. Nor does it claim to be merely a compilation. While no new facts are introduced, the author claims as his own the arrangement, style, grouping of incidents, and interpretation of facts.

Wesley's life will always be interesting to students of religious history. He was not a mere theologian, but a *practical worker* as well; and Methodism owes its existence to-day more to his organizing ability than to any peculiar class of doctrines he taught.

We can not dismiss this little volume without calling attention to the beautiful manner in which it is printed. It furnishes but another evidence that the West is as capable of producing as fine work in book-making as any other place on the globe. We do not deny that in this fact we feel considerable pride.

- 
- 19.—*Questions of the Day.* By Rev. JOHN HALL, D. D., Pastor of Fifth-avenue Presbyterian Church, New York. 12mo.

AMONG the questions discussed in this volume are the following: Is the Sabbath Obsolete? Should We Pray? Is Christianity to be Modernized? Is the Human Race One? What is the Church to do about

Amusements? It will be seen that most of these are vital questions, and touch some of the living issues of the age. The discussion is in an easy, familiar style; and, though the doctor's reasoning is not always conclusive, there is very little in the volume that is not calculated to promote healthy thinking. The first question is about as well handled as could be expected from any one occupying Dr. Hall's religious point of view. In the treatment of the subjects involving the relations of science and religion, the doctor is admirable in temper, careful in statement, and generally conclusive in argument. The style of the book is popular. It is evidently intended for the people, and, if carefully read, it ought to produce a good influence upon the minds of those who are exposed to the protean forms of modern infidelity.

---

- 20.—*Wonders of the Moon*. Translated from the French of Amadée Guillemin, by Miss M. G. MEAD. Edited, with additions, by MARIA MITCHELL, of Vassar College, New York. Illustrated with forty-three engravings. New York: Scribner, Armstrong & Co. Cincinnati: George E. Stevens & Co. 1873. 12mo. pp. 241.

THIS book is "intended for popular reading. It is neither for the school-room nor the observatory; it is adapted to that large class of persons who, in an age which tends very decidedly to physical research, wish to know something of *scientific facts*—those whose occupations do not afford them time for study, or who, from defects in their early training, believe themselves incapable of mathematics. From the first page to the last there is not a problem; not a triangle is drawn." Such a work as this must be very acceptable to the people. It can scarcely fail to interest them in a very high degree; and then, as it treats of things which they ought to know something about, it will convey to them useful knowledge. Works of this kind are popular educators, and it is one of the healthy signs of the times that such books are published in the interests of the masses. Every volume of the "Illustrated Library of Wonders" is a good book, and this one is equal to any of the best.

---

- 21.—*Prehistoric Races of the United States*. By Col. J. W. FOSTER, LL. D. Illustrated. Chicago: S. C. Griggs & Co. 1874. Crown 8vo.

THIS is a really valuable contribution to American archæology. It is, in fact, one of the best and clearest accounts that has been written concerning those grand monuments which are the remains of a long forgotten race. This whole subject is just now invested with a new interest. Recent discoveries make it no longer doubtful that we are approaching very nearly a satisfactory solution of some of the difficult questions connected with the origin of man. Darwinism may not be true when considered as a



system; but that it will ultimately lead to the discovery of truth, we do not for a moment doubt. Many of Mr. Darwin's facts can not be questioned, and these should never be made to suffer simply because we are not willing to accept all his conclusions. We may say the same thing of the volume before us. Its statement of facts is generally trustworthy, but the author's deductions are not always to be accepted as conclusive.

- 
- 22.—*A Grammar of the New Testament Greek.* By ALEXANDER BUTTMAN. Andover: Warren F. Draper. 8vo. pp. 474.

WHOEVER has a thorough acquaintance with classical Greek will find this Grammar a very valuable adjunct in the study of New Testament Greek. It is useless to hope that a student who has never made himself acquainted with classical Greek can become a Greek scholar. He may learn to read the New Testament in the original, and may be able to accomplish something in Greek exegesis; but his success can only be partial, and his criticisms must always be taken at very considerable discount, Buttmann's Grammar is intended for scholars, not for those who have a mere smattering of the Greek language. To those who are prepared to use it, it furnishes facilities for accurate study of the New Testament; and as the peculiarities of form and construction are well classified, it will be found very convenient as a book of reference.

- 
- 23.—*The Character of St. Paul.* By J. S. HOWSON, D. D. New York: Dodd & Mead. 1874. 12mo. pp. 314.

DR. HOWSON has made the character of Paul a study for many years, and it is doubtful whether there is another man living who could write a better volume than this one upon the same subject. To understand Paul, one has to come into sympathy with him. There must be fellowship with his sufferings, and a genuine appreciation of his strong personality. These things our author sees with the greatest interest, and, working from these points of departure, he has written a volume which is not only instruction for the head, but is precious food for the heart, and can scarcely fail to stimulate religious activity in any one who will carefully read it.

- 
- 24.—*Art Culture.* Selections from John Ruskin. Edited by Rev. W. T. PLATT. Colored Plates and Illustrations. New York: John Wiley & Son. 12mo. pp. 485.

THERE are not many persons who care to read all John Ruskin has written, and yet he has written very little that is not worthy of being read. We must deal, however, with facts as they are, not as we would have them.

Vol. VI.—9

From some cause or other, people generally do not read Ruskin's complete works. Hence, we think these selections will be very favorably received. For the most part, the editor has done his work well. He has brought system out of that which was before chaotic confusion. He shows you what the man of genius is when dressed up by the man of talent.

- 
- 25.—*Index to Systematic Theology.* By CHARLES HODGE, D. D. New York: Scribner, Armstrong & Co. Cincinnati: Robert Clarke & Co. 1873. 8vo. pp. 81.

WITHOUT such an index as this,\* the "Systematic Theology" would be incomplete. This gives a proper finish to Dr. Hodge's great work, and will enable the reader to find almost any thing with comparatively little difficulty. In looking over the Index, we are surprised to find how little use Dr. Hodge has made of American theological writers. Some of the most prominent theologians in this country are not referred to at all in his work. This may be well enough; but there is an affectation about the value of European opinions that may as well be understood. A book on theology for American consumption can not be what it ought to be without doing ample justice to American authors.

- 
- 26.—*Arthur Bonnicastle.* An American Novel. By J. S. HOLLAND. New York: Scribner, Armstrong & Co. Cincinnati: George E. Stevens & Co. 1873.

THIS is one of Dr. Holland's most pretentious books, and at once entitles him to rank high as a writer of fiction. "Miss Gilbert's Career" was not a very promising venture in this field of authorship; but the doctor has fairly conquered in his last work. The story was first published in *Scribner's Monthly* as a serial, where it attracted very general attention. It will now doubtless become a standard among our American novels. We have only space to note that the doctor's religious views are very nearly in harmony with those advocated by the Disciples.

- 
- 27.—*A Grammar of the Greek Language.* By Dr. GEORGE CURTIUS, Professor in the University of Leipsic. Translated under the revision of the Author. Edited by WILLIAM SMITH, LL. D., Classical Examiner in the University of London, and Editor of the Classical and Latin Dictionaries. For the use of Colleges and High-schools. New York: Harper & Bros. Cincinnati: Robert Clarke & Co. 1872. 16mo. pp. 369.

THIS Grammar must soon become the standard in this country, as it is in Europe. Some very decided improvements have been introduced, especially in the classification of the declension of nouns and tenses of

verbs. There is much in the old Grammars that is simply "confusion worse confounded," and it affords us pleasure to call attention to a work which promises to bring order out of this confusion.

- 28.—*Triumphing Over Death.* A Narrative of the Closing Scenes of the Life of William Gordon, M. D., F. L. S., of Kingston-upon-Hull. By NEWMAN HALL, D. D. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden. 1873. 16mo. pp. 263.

THIS is a beautiful and touching tribute to the memory of a good and useful man, by one who was his companion, friend, and brother. The style is simple but forcible; not always elegant, but always perspicuous and earnest. The story is full of practical details, and will scarcely fail to stimulate religious activity and piety.

- 29.—*Against the Stream.* By the Author of the "Schonberg-Cotta Family." New York: Dodd & Mead. Cincinnati: Robert Clarke & Co. 1874. 12mo. pp. 587.

THE object of this book is to show that social reformations are always attended with difficulty, and are generally unpopular in their beginnings. It has some of the vigor and fine historical grouping that characterizes this author's style, but is scarcely equal to her best work in freshness and happy delineation of character.

---

## FOREIGN LITERATURE.

### BOOKS.

- 1.—*Histoire du Synode Général de l'Église Réformée de France; Paris, 6 Juin—10 Juillet, 1872.* (History of the General Synod of the Reformed Church of France, held in Paris from June 6th to July 10th, 1872. By EUGENE BERSIER.) Paris: Sandoz and Fisch Cacher. 1872. Two vols., large 8vo. pp. 413, 488.

THE greatest event in the Reformed Church of France to-day, and, indeed, so far as its significance and its probable ultimate results are concerned, the greatest event that has occurred in it during the present century, is the convocation of the General Synod last year. To understand this, it is necessary to look briefly at the past and present history of that Church.

The first period of the Reformation in France, is marked necessarily, as elsewhere the State did not enter into it nor recognize it, by a serious

lack of unity and organization. The Reformers and their sentiments made their way here and there, in a scattered way, and small congregations or companies were collected in many parts of France. Each one of these, according to the presbyterial form of government inaugurated by Calvin, and universally accepted by the French Reformation, managed and governed itself in a separate existence, as best it could. The danger both to the doctrine and order of this condition of the congregations became more and more obvious, and excited alarm in the minds of the leading Reformers and other thoughtful men in the Reformed Churches. Referring to this period, our author says:

"During this period there was no clearly defined organization. To effect an organization, it was necessary to come together and to deliberate calmly; and the danger was great. There was no regular ministry. The faithful were edified by traveling preachers, who administered the sacraments. In the assemblies, portions of the Scriptures were read from the Bible of Olivetan, or that of Lefevre d'Etaples, or from the new translations of Geneva; every one added his own comments. Simple laymen taught the people; and the worship varied with the localities. There was here an evident danger for the Reformation; all errors, all follies could appeal to it, and grow up in it; and this great movement was in danger of perishing in disorder and anarchy, and its enemies could with right confound it with the licentious errors and perverse delusions of which the *Lutherans* had a horror. It was necessary, at any price, to assemble the representatives of the Churches, recognize the common faith, and fix the forms of worship and the authority of the ministry. With this purpose, toward the end of 1558, Antoine de Chandieu, minister at Paris, and several of his colleagues, met at Poitiers. 'After the celebration of the Supper,' Theodore Beza relates, 'the assembled ministers talked together about the doctrine, the order, and the discipline observed among them; and, after discussing these matters, they soon saw how great a good it would be, if it so pleased God, if all the Churches of France should draw up, by a common accord, a confession of faith and an ecclesiastical discipline; and also, if this were not done, great evils would arise, and divisions, both in doctrine and discipline, the Churches not being bound together and ranged under the same yoke of order and ecclesiastical polity.' It is thus that the convocation of the first Synod was decided on, which met the 25th of May, 1559."

This General Synod became, and remained for a long time, the effective power of unity in faith and life in the French Protestant Church. This unity was very close, and as long as it remained supported by the general convocation in which all the congregations were represented, and all interests of faith, discipline, and general welfare considered and provided for, the Reformed Church offered a strong resistance to the power of its enemies.

When the French Government had vowed the destruction of the Reformed religion, it determined, as a necessary and most effectual step, to put an end to these general assemblies. At the Twenty-ninth National Synod, held at Loudon in 1659, the royal commissioner appeared, and read the decree of the king forbidding the holding of these Synods for the future, without the royal consent. This consent was never again given, either by Louis XIV, or any Government of France after him, until November, 1871; and no general Synod ever again assembled until June, 1872.

After the abolition of the General Synod—this center of their unity

and of strength—the French Protestants entered upon a heroic age of glorious resistance to persecutions from without and evil influences from within. It was the long and terrible history of the *Church in the Wilderness*, so well written by Ch. Coquerel;\* it is the bloodiest, the darkest, but, at the same time, the most heroic chapter in the entire history of Protestantism, and should, for its great deeds of faith and its great lessons, be familiar to every Protestant. The aim of the persecuting power of Catholic France was to break down every stronghold of the Reformed Church, to destroy every center and power of unity and strength, to smite the shepherds and scatter the flocks.

In the midst of the terrible scenes that followed the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes, when several hundred thousands fled or were banished from France, the houses of worship destroyed, the children of the Protestants forced into Catholic schools, all their homes invaded by priests and dragoons, and all worship denied them, and when every thing seemed to be lost, great hearts among them nobly resolved, at every peril, to save the great cause of the Evangelical Church in France. Our author says:

"It was nevertheless then, under this merciless, persecuting Government, that a man of faith and of burning energy, Antoine Court, dared to dream of the restoration of Protestantism. With several obscure preachers, he attempted this prodigious work; he convoked in the Vivarais, in 1726, the first National Synod of the Desert. The faithful men met together, and the Church felt itself re-established. Eight times afterward, from 1726 to 1763, these solemn assemblies took place, oftenest in the open air, on some remote, almost inaccessible rocks, or in deep caverns. Here earnest, solemn deliberations were held; no point of doctrine was lightly treated; these men knew too well that here lay the power of the Church. At every meeting, before all, the old Confession of Faith was read, and every one pledged himself to abide in it; they also prayed there for their persecuting king. . . . What is worthy of admiration, is the coolness and the good sense which presided at these assemblies; no trace of extravagant excitement or of illuminism. They had seen too well, in the wars of the Cevennes, the character and effect of the inspirations of the *prophets*. This ardent race knows how to subject itself to discipline, and how to obey the voice of duty." (Vol. I, p. 36.)

The events of the concluding decades of last century in France mightily affected also the minds of the Reformed Church. It was very natural that the Protestants should turn with eagerness toward the men that in France preached liberty of opinion and of conduct. With many, devotion to the old faith was weakened, although, generally, the Churches held faithfully to the evangelical truths of the ancient Protestant faith.

As soon as religious liberty had been given to France, as a part of the great victories of freedom of 1789, many of the most earnest of the Reformed Church at once began to move to re-establish its autonomy, by a restoration by the General Synod. A request to this effect was made to Napoleon I. But it did not accord with his views and purposes to have any thing in his State independent of himself. An entire people, a Church of any creed, governing itself, ungoverned by him, he could not for a moment

\* "*Histoire des Églises du Désert.*" Two vols.

conceive of or endure. It was altogether contrary to his policy; he must have every thing in his despotic hands. He granted to the Reformed the law of *Germinal, Year X*, which re-established and recognized their Church, but denied them religious autonomy; this Church, as well as the Catholic, must be in *his* hands. His honeyed, high-sounding words, worthy of the tragic stage, which he uttered to the Protestant ministers that were invited to attend his coronation, show how false are often the fairest pretenses of princes, and what a distance there is often between words and deeds.

"I see with pleasure," said Napoleon, "assembled here, the pastors of the Reformed Churches of France. I seize with eagerness this occasion to testify to them how much I have always been satisfied with all that has been reported to me of the fidelity and good conduct of the pastors and the citizens of the different Protestant Communions. I am very anxious that it be known that my intention and my firm wish is to maintain religious liberty. The empire of law ends where the indefinite empire of conscience begins; neither the law nor the prince have any power against this liberty. Such are my principles and those of my nation; and if any one of those of my race that is to succeed me shall forget the oath that I have taken, and if, deceived by the inspiration of a false conscience, he shall violate it, I devote him to public reproach, and I authorize you to give him the name of Nero." (Vol. I, p. 28, 29.)

These grandiloquent words have been often cited; but experience showed that, to this great egotistical autocrat, they were but theatrical rhetoric. He did not hesitate to extend his rule over this "*empire indéfini de la conscience*." He governed every thing.

The law by which Napoleon regulated the Reformed Church, is that, with slight changes, under which it has lived until the present change. Under the tutelage of the State, instead of growing, by vigorous self-development, in numbers and power, it has really grown weaker. Such a consequence was inevitable. In the first place, it lacked the self-reliance and vigorous development of strength, which perfect freedom alone can give. Secondly, as in England, Germany, and Switzerland, the leaven of rationalism—*liberalism*, as its advocates prefer to call it—made all this time steady progress, as there was, in matters of faith, no control or restraint as of old; the State, like Gallio, "caring for none of these things." The great family of the Huguenots, once so strong in Biblical faith, was gradually losing faith in the great verities of Christianity. The orthodox or evangelical party, strong since the religious revival of 1815-25, urged, year after year, with increasing power and zeal, the acceptance of a true Biblical faith; while, however, no one any longer thought of imposing on any one's conscience, be he pastor or layman, the ancient Calvinistic creed of Rochelle. That had been suffered to fall into decay and disuse, never again to be revived. To restore again to the Church its ancient self-government, by a re-establishment of the General Synod, and thus to bring it again to unity of faith and to power, and to counteract and cure the devouring canker of unbelief, in the form of *liberalism*, in its ministry, has been the ardent wish



and the watchword, for a number of years, of the Evangelical portion of the National Reformed Church. Steps had already been taken with the Government of Napoleon III, to secure this boon, and there is no doubt that the emperor would have granted it; the question was pending and progressing during the last months of his reign. The demand was renewed with the Government of the Republic, and on the 29th of November, 1871, President Thiers issued a decree for the convocation—after so long an interval—of the General Synod of the Reformed Churches of France. Its meeting was fixed for the following June. The Evangelical party hailed this event with joy.

But from the moment the first steps were taken, with the Government of Napoleon III, to obtain the calling of the National Synod, the Liberals did their utmost in opposition to it. They knew very well that, in a General Synod, the Evangelicals, or, as they call them, the Orthodox, would have the predominance, and that an Evangelical platform of faith would be adopted and prescribed for the ministry. Such a platform, however simple, could not be accepted by the Liberals, and would finally and necessarily result in shutting them out from the exercise of the office of the ministry. The strange sight was witnessed, and is yet witnessed, of *Liberals* advocating the continuance of the Church, under strong State tutelage, against self-government. This is by no means, however, the only instance of such *liberalism* in Europe. The reason is obvious. Under the State Government, the Church had no control over the faith and doctrinal teaching of the pastors, while these receive their salaries from the State. The Liberals, however, were unable to prevent the assembling of the Synod. At its meeting, over one hundred members were present, representing the best talents in the Reformed Church, and, in their due proportion, the Evangelical and the Liberal parties; the *Right* and the *Left*, as they were called, according to French parliamentary usage.

A great interest attaches to the debates and proceedings of this Synod. It was Protestant France, in its most eminent representatives, composed, according to the old Huguenot rule, of ministers and laymen, that had met again, after the lapse of two centuries, to discuss and decide upon all the grave questions of the Reformed Church. There were present men from all the eminent ranks of society, statesmen and soldiers included. Several were members of the National Assembly. Conspicuous among these, perhaps most eminent, was Guizot, in spite of the burden of over four-score years—fresh, vigorous, and prompt in debate, and a most decided representative of the extreme Right, the orthodox side. It is a grand sight to see such a man, in such a place and at such an age, rise so bravely to the defense of the ancient faith of the Bible. With immense resources of knowledge, and with great power of argument, and with wonderful spirit, he

exposed the errors and the destructive tendencies of the *Liberal*, anti-Biblical doctrines and workings. Against the negations of Liberalism he declared:

"A common faith is the principle and the basis of every religious society, and this principle has prevailed and been maintained amidst the most diverse epochs and social conditions. Allow me to recall a recollection of my youth. Sixty-five years ago I visited in the Cevennes, at Pont-de-Monvert, an uncle of my mother; he was a minister. There was there, as yet, no house of worship; the people assembled on the summit of the mountain, on a plateau, which could well also be called *the wilderness*. My granduncle asked me, before the sermon, to read the lesson from the Bible; two or three thousand peasants were there assembled. What had brought them together? Faith in the authority of the Holy Scriptures—a faith not learned, but living, and the bond of their union. . . . This is the natural and necessary bond of religious society. . . . We have been witnessing already long enough a new explosion of anti-Christian zeal. Pantheism, which is only a materialism skillfully disguised; historical criticism, whose scientific liberty I would never wish restrained,—have no right to enter and reign in our Churches, and to establish there their negations in the place of the great facts which are the objects of Christian faith and Christian tradition."

Interrupted here by Coquerel, the ablest of the Opposition, he continued:

"The Christian people are not deceived; they do not consider as Christians those who deny the origin, the actions, the supernatural life and death of Jesus Christ. The war against the supernatural is the moral malady of our time—a war which goes farther and leads to greater consequences than some, even of those who wage it, believe. I have heard an illustrious *savant*, a man of genius in mathematical sciences, say, 'God is an hypothesis of which I have no need.' This is the point to which the road leads on which many are traveling to-day. If I were to allow myself here to say all that I really think on all these questions, I would declare that I find the pantheism and the historical criticism of our time much less philosophical and less profound than their adepts imagine them to be. I, too, have drunk, like others, of the cup of human knowledge, and more than others, of the cup of human power; but I have learned also to know their limits and their insufficiency to give satisfaction to the religious wants of the human soul, and of human society. The world has had no lack either of great philosophers or great politicians. But no one of them has founded or maintained a religion; no more Socrates or Plato than Cæsar or Marcus Aurelius.

"God alone, by the natural and supernatural action which he exercises according to his purposes over men, accomplishes such a work. We are living under the eye of God, gentlemen; neither science nor ingenuity can deceive him. He reads in our hearts, and knows those who serve his cause." (*Ibid*, p. 290.)

The great questions of debate between the believing and the unbelieving hosts, between the men of faith and the men of negations, were the living points of controversy on this memorable occasion, and were discussed with great ability, and with all the passion and ardor that moves the prominent leaders of both sides. These two volumes are, therefore, very important in the history of this great religious controversy of our time. M. Bersier has done his work with the strictest faithfulness, and with great fullness. This Synod was the crisis in the National Reformed Church of France. The contending parties are, however, yet in the field against each other, and the future is not yet clear.

The Evangelical party, we rejoice to say, as shown by the Synod, is in the

majority in Protestant France. From first to last, the *Liberals* were very decidedly in the minority in the Synod, and constituted the Left. Their reading men, like Ath. Coquerel, Jr., Clameragan, Professor Colani, and others, did their best—and they are able men for their cause—but in vain. M. Professor Bois, with others, submitted the following as a platform, or Declaration of Faith, that constituted the hot center of the battle, and that, after much discussion, was adopted:

"The undersigned have the honor of proposing to the synods the adoption of the present Declaration of Faith:

"At the moment when it resumes again the course of its synods, interrupted for so many years, the Reformed Church of France feels, before all things, the need of giving thanks to God, and to testify its love for Jesus Christ, its Divine Head, who has sustained and consoled it through so many trials.

"It declares that it remains faithful to the principles of faith and freedom, on which it was founded.

"With its Fathers and its martyrs, in the Confession of Rochelle, with all the Churches of the Reformation in their symbols, it proclaims *the supreme authority of the Holy Scriptures in matters of faith, and the salvation by faith in Jesus Christ, only Son of God, who died for our offenses, and was raised for our justification.*

"It preserves, therefore, and it maintains, as the basis of its teaching, of its worship and its discipline, the great Christian facts represented in its religious, solemn acts, and expressed in its liturgies, especially in the confession of sins, in the Symbol of the Apostles, and in the Liturgy of the Holy Supper." (*Ibid*, p. 117.)

Such a declaration, not because of its being a declaration, but because of what it contains, could not be accepted by the *Liberals* with their no-faith of negations. It must strike also every one how simple and limited, in comparison to the Confession of Rochelle and all the ancient Protestant confessions, this Declaration of Faith is. Yet on it the battle between the Evangelicals, now in the ascendent, and the *Liberals*, will have to be fought out.

---

2.—*Der grosse Papyrus Harris. Ein wichtiger Beitrag zur aegyptischen Geschichte, ein 3000 Jahre altes Zeugniß für die mosaische Religionsstiftung enthaltend. Vortrag gehalten im philosophisch-historischen Verein zu Heidelberg, von Dr. AUGUST EISENLOHR, Docent der aegyptischen Sprache an der Universität Heidelberg.* (The Great Harris Papyrus. An Important Contribution to Egyptian History, containing a Three Thousand Years' Old Witness to the Establishment of the Jewish Religion by Moses. A Lecture delivered before the Philosophic-historical Association at Heidelberg, by Dr. AUGUST EISENLOHR, Teacher of the Egyptian Language at the University of Heidelberg.) Leipsic. 1872.

THE discovery of this papyrus-roll by the Englishman, Mr. A. C. Harris, and its translation by Dr. Eisenlohr, as well as the important historical statements concerning Egypt it contains, have excited a good deal of attention and interest in the Old and the New World. The lecture by Dr. Eisenlohr, here published, is the fullest information the public has as yet received of this, the most important monument of old Egyptian literature

as yet known to us in its original form. In the opening of his lecture, Dr. Eisenlohr gives an account of the valuable discoveries of Mr. Harris in Egypt, including this large papyrus-roll:

"The communication which I propose to make to you concerns an Egyptian manuscript or papyrus, with which I, for the first time, had an opportunity of becoming acquainted during my visit to Egypt in 1869-70. It belonged to A. C. Harris, of Alexandria, who died in 1869, the meritorious editor of the *Hieroglyphical Standard*. I received, at that time, the permission to copy several pages of the papyrus, which I translated after my return home. Lately the daughter of the deceased, Miss Selina Harris, the present possessor of this roll, came to England with her entire collection of antiquities, which, in 1870, endured, without material damage, a terrible explosion of gun-cotton. Her purpose in bringing this collection to Europe was to sell it. I received the permission to study these treasures, and to prepare a catalogue of them, which I did within the last few weeks, in New Brighton. The collection consists, besides a large number of Egyptian monuments, sarcophagi, written tablets, busts, etc., of nine hieroglyphical and hieratical and five Greek papyrus-rolls, and about one hundred and fifty Coptic fragments. These rolls will most probably be purchased by the English Government, and come into the possession of the British Museum.

"Among the Greek papyri is the Eighteenth Song of the Iliad, which was found in the cave *Ma' Abdey*, in the neighborhood of Siut, in the hand of the mummy of the Greek grammarian Trypho, who lived in the days of the Emperor Augustus; fragments of an oration of Hyperides against Demosthenes and Lycophoon, published already by Mr. Harris in 1848; fragments of a work of Apollodorus; a Greek horoscope, etc.

"Of greater importance are the rolls written in the Egyptian writing. With the exception of two leaves, which refer to the Egyptian service of the dead, and are written in hieroglyphics (that is, in images), these rolls are in the hieratic writing (that is, in the more cursive manner), which is related to the hieroglyphic as our writing is to print. The largest of these hieratic rolls is that one of which I shall speak more fully by and by."

Mr. Harris, as quoted by Dr. Eisenlohr, gives a brief description of the place where these valuable literary treasures were found, which is dated January, 1858. The discovery, Dr. Eisenlohr thinks, was made some years before this date.

#### "THE PAPYRUS PLACE.

"Behind the temple of *Medinet-Abu* (lying, as is well known, above ancient Thebes, on the left bank of the Nile,) in the gorge which leads to *Der el Medinet*, two hundred and twenty-five paces over the mounds of *débris* from the north side of the wall of *Der el Medinet* toward the foot of the southern hill of the gorge, about twenty feet below the surface of the ground, is a rough grotto in the rock, which, when first opened, was filled with mummies, that in former time had all been torn to pieces. In this grotto, under the mummies, was a hollow in the rock, in which these papyrus-rolls were found together. This hole was covered with broken pieces of pottery, that were united to the earth, that covered it with clay. We found nothing in this grotto but mummy-wrappings and bones."

In a subsequent paragraph, the author gives a description of this famous papyrus:

"More valuable than all these rolls is the one to which I ask your attention to-day, the one which I call the *Great Harris Papyrus*, the most beautiful, the largest, best-written, and best-preserved of all the papyrus-rolls that have come down to us. It is not less than forty and a half metres (about one hundred and thirty feet) long, and forty-two and a half centimetres broad. It is now unrolled and divided into seventy leaves, which average fifty-one centimetres (about one and a half feet) in length, and forty-two and a half in breadth.

The whole piece consists of an address of King Rameses III (*Rauserma Meriamon*—that is, 'sun, strong through the truth, loved of Ammon'; *Ramses hag an*—that is, 'Rameses, Prince, or King, of Heliopolis'), made in the thirty-second year of his reign, to his officers and people. It contains a full description of what the king did during the long period of his reign, especially what he did for the gods of Egypt and their temples, and also of the presents which he made to the temples of Upper and Lower Egypt."

This city of *An*, in lower Egypt, one of the most ancient in the world, is in the Hebrew Scriptures called אֵן (*On*), or, as the anti-punctuists would write it, *Aun*, after this Egyptian name, which signifies "Sun." Hence the Septuagint, following the Greek, translates Heliopolis, "City of the Sun," and, in Jeremiah xliii, 13, it is translated in Hebrew by "Beth-shemesh" (house, or city, of the sun).

In the introduction to the historical part, on the seventy-fifth page, are related the events that preceded the reign of Rameses III. The first part of this passage reads as follows:

"King Rauserma Meriamon—life, blessing, health, the great God—says, to the princes, the first men of the land, the archers, the horsemen, *Scharidana*, numerous allies to all the living of the land of *Ta Mera* (Egypt): Hear! I will let you see all my mighty deeds which I have done as king of men. The land of Egypt had fallen into decay; each one did as he listed; there was no ruler for many years that had the supreme power over others' things. The land of Egypt belonged to the princes in the plains. One slew the other in jealousy. Other times followed, amid years of trouble. A Syrian leader had raised himself up to be ruler among them. He brought the whole land in subjection to his own control. He assembled his followers, plundered the treasures of the land. They declared the gods to be but like unto men. Sacrifices were no longer offered in the sanctuaries of the temples. The images of the gods were cast down to rest on the ground. His will was in harmony with his purpose," etc.

This "Syrian leader" is believed to be no other than Moses. The reasons which Dr. Eisenlohr gives in his lecture for this, are certainly not without weight. Altogether, this mammoth papyrus is the most interesting and valuable literary treasure yet rescued from the old Egyptian tombs. A number of passages, translated by Dr. Eisenlohr, are given in his lecture.

- 
- 2.—*Johann von Wiclif und die Vorgeschichte der Reformation.* Von GOTTHARD LECHLER, der Theologie Doctor und Ordentlicher Professor, Superintendent zu Leipzig. (John de Wiclif and the History of Reformatory Movements Preceding the Reformation. By GOTTHARD LECHLER, Doctor and Ordinary Professor of Theology and Superintendent at Leipsic.) Leipsic: Friedrich Fleischer. 1873. 2 vols. Large 8vo. pp. 743 and 654.

The present generation has produced no work on the Reformation period, embracing the great antecedent movements in England, Bohemia, and elsewhere, of more profound research, offering a richer treasury of material information in its field, and of deeper interest than the one whose title we have here given. The author, Dr. Lechler, is already well known for his

very valuable contributions to German literature, especially in the religious historical department. All his productions, like the present, are characterized by thoroughness of study. This work will certainly be of standard value in the Reformation literature; the German language, at least, has nothing equal to it, as a complete history, on the great subject of which it treats.

The history of Wiclif and of the religious movement which proceeded from him, and of which he was the grand personal center, is one of the most remarkable, and, in its immense bearing, most important epochs in the general religious history of Europe since the Middle Ages. From the hour that the darkness of the Empire of Papal Rome fell upon the world of Europe, till the day of Luther, no form stands forth so grand in his personality, and so mighty in power against the corruptions and haughty assumptions of the Man of Sin, no one sounding forth with such clear notes the voice of human freedom against the spiritual and temporal slavery of Rome, as that of the great English Reformer. Wiclif started a fire in England that all the power of the Pope could not quench, but that spread wider and wider till it embraced all England—all Great Britain—crossed the sea, and spread its flames all over Central and Western Europe, penetrating to the very shores of the Mediterranean. He was the John the Baptist of the great reformations of the sixteenth century. He was a stern, reformatory character, like that of the harbinger—a “mighty voice crying aloud in the wilderness,” whose echoes resounded loud in the Papal palace, calling on men to reform, to turn from their idols to the living Christ.

In reading the pages of this wonderful history before us, this majestic form assumes grander and grander proportions, till it stands outlined in massive size and sublime elevation against the dark heavens of his day, like the pyramids, or like Mont Blanc, sovereign of the Alps, against the sky of night; but, like the pyramids, and the loftiest Alpine summits too, in the last watches of the night, with his head already illumined with the morning brightness of a glorious day. It is the beginning of the heroic age of the warfare against the dark dominion of Rome that Lechler describes, whose first greatest embodiment is Wiclif. As we move amid the living forms and living scenes of these ancient days of battle between truth and error, light and darkness; as we witness the valor with which these mighty souls met the dense hosts of their enemies, and hear the loud ring of their tremendous blows, we feel heroically inspired with a deeper love and more burning ardor and courage for truth and righteousness, and feel purer and stronger for the conflicts of our own day.

The greatness of men can only truly be measured by the state of the times in which they lived, and by the enduring effect for good their lives



have had on succeeding ages. By this standard we must measure such men as Wiclif, Huss, and others in various lands, who, amid the low level of the ignorance and depravity and spiritual and intellectual bondage of their day, rose up, by the touch of God's Spirit, to lofty heights of light and purity and freedom of soul.

"For in those dark and iron days of old,  
Arose, amid the pigmies of their age,  
Minds of a massive and gigantic mold,  
Whom we must measure as the Cretan sage  
Measured the pyramids of ages past,  
By the far-reaching shadows that they cast."

It very naturally arose in our author's mind, that the question would arise, why a *German* should undertake to subject the life of Wiclif to a new investigation in the face of England's eminent minds, who, as it might reasonably be supposed, have the first right and the superior ability to study, to understand, and set forth to the world the history of the great English Reformer, and who have already, in such an eminent degree, performed this high task.

"It would not be surprising," says Dr. Lechler, "if the attempt of a *German* to investigate anew the life and doctrine of Wiclif, and set them forth as the central point of the entire history of the reformatory movement preceding the Reformation should, for more than one reason, awaken doubts of his right to do this. At a time when national feeling is every-where more than ever excited, it is inevitable that the look into the past times, and the remembrance of earlier generations, should take a national and patriotic direction. Therefore, an Englishman would have a nearer right, and feel a more urgent duty to erect a literary monument to a great son of his own father-land than either a German or any other foreigner. Besides, if a historical work, in order to advance science, if not exclusively yet chiefly, must have a regard to the opening of new, hitherto concealed or less accessible sources, it would seem to lie in the nature of things, that a service of this kind should be possible only to a native, but not to a foreigner. And, in fact, hitherto it has been only Englishmen whose labors on Wiclif have opened the historical treasures, and have furnished satisfactory results. In the last century, an Anglican rector, John Lewis, wrote the first real, complete biography of Wiclif, whose eminent merit lies yet, especially, in the collection and publication of materials. In our century, it was the learned Dr. Robert Vaughn, who has advanced the historical knowledge concerning Wiclif to such a degree, that his works are pretty generally acknowledged as authority, and have been explored as a store-house of information. The historical investigations, as well as the theological science of the various European peoples, has been directed to what Englishmen have produced. Also, the later meritorious investigations in the field of the Wiclif literature—the labors of a Todd, Shirley, Arnold, and others—belong all to the English nation. Every one must regard this as very natural. Not even the kindred nations of the Scotch and the American have thus far, in any noteworthy degree, produced any thing in the researches of Wiclif's history. The more strange and pretentious, therefore, must it seem, when a German is seen entering this field like a 'Saul among the prophets.'

"And yet the author has ventured this step. He hopes for pardon for this act; and, indeed, he believes he may claim a certain right in the wide field of international science. For it is simply a prejudice to assume that new sources for the history of Wiclif can, as a matter of course, only be opened in Great Britain and Ireland. On the Continent too, and especially on German ground, are flowing rich fountains, from which, as yet, too little has

been drawn. To approach these, and from their fullness to furnish something that can serve to complete, to enrich, and even to correct, the hitherto current knowledge, is not only a right claimed by the author, but even a kind of duty imposed on him."

This modest defense, certainly, every candid, generous mind must appreciate and accept, and the reader of these volumes will freely confess that the author has made good this claim.

The point of view from which our author proceeds in his conception and treatment of the history of Wiclif, is set forth in the following words:

"Once for all, is it the duty of the historian that every important personality should necessarily be represented in connection with his contemporary surroundings, with his historical background and foreground. Above all, when it is a man from whom great movements have gone forth, that were felt not only in his own country, but all over Europe for more than a century, then, in order to do justice to his personal importance, the point of view must be taken higher, and the circle of historical investigation be enlarged. And this is precisely, in a high degree, the case with Wiclif.

"The University of Prague has a splendid Hussite 'Cantionale' of the year 1572, beautifully written on exquisite parchment of large size, and ornamented with admirably executed miniature-pictures, illustrating the Tscheck hymns. On the margin of each leaf, on which begins a hymn to the memorial-day of Master John Huss, are three medallions, ranged one above another. The first represents Wiclif striking fire; the next below, John Huss kindling the coal with the fire; finally, the third represents Dr. Luther with the brightly burning torch. This trilogy of miniatures indicates, symbolically, the mission of these three men in their connection, and the dependence of each one on his predecessor.

"A similar idea lies at the foundation of the present book. John de Wiclif, according to my conviction, is the greatest of all the forerunners of the Reformation of the sixteenth century. He was the first who, with all the resources of a superior mind, and with all the power of a determined will, and with the entire fullness of his personality, entered into the conflict for the thought and the task of a reform of the Church, even if not yet conceived with sufficient clearness and depth. And thus he gave public opinion an impulse which was, first of all, felt in his own country to the beginning of the Reformation. But also on the Continent the waves of the stream that proceeded from Wiclif can be traced, especially with Huss and the great Hussite movement, in which was involved the whole Western Church with the two Ecumenical Councils of Constance and Bale. So much the more does the historical significance of Wiclif seem to demand that both the efforts that preceded him, and the consequences of his opinions and labors, should be more closely examined."

The first volume is devoted to a sketch of the religious condition of Europe before Wiclif, to the middle of the fourteenth century. In these chapters are passed in review before us the great men and the great movements that characterize the eventful pre-reformation periods, and that must all be kept in view to enable us to understand and appreciate the influences that brought about the reformatory movements in Wiclif, and from him onward; and also the great questions and actions of these movements themselves. Among the men of chief prominence on English ground, presented to us as the precursors and teachers, in a certain sense, of Wiclif himself, are Robert Grosstête, Bishop of Lincoln, Richard of Armagh, and Thomas of Bradwardin—names never to be forgotten, shining forth in their day like stars amid the darkness of night. The second part of the first volume treats of Wiclif's life and labors.

Our author closes his account of Grosstête with the following paragraph, in which he sets forth the opinion we, as Protestants, should entertain of this great Englishman :

"We, as Protestants, have no reason to complain that the honor was denied to the Bishop of Lincoln of being invoked as the patron and tutelar saint, of having here and there his own altars and images in the churches, and his own saint's-day. But we believe it to be our right and our duty to honor the memory of a man like him. His confession of faith, it is true, is not the evangelical; but his piety is so earnest and sincere, his zeal for the honor of God so fervent, his care for the salvation of his own soul and for the souls of those, by virtue of his office, committed to his charge, so conscientious, his fidelity so constant, his will so energetic, his sentiments so free from the fear of men and the desire to please men, his bearing so firm and so incorruptible, that his whole character obliges us to yield it the tribute of the purest and the deepest respect. If we consider, furthermore, how highly he esteemed the Holy Scriptures, whose study he places, in the University of Oxford, in fundamental importance, as first, and which he recognizes as the only infallible guiding-star of the Church; if we recognize how active and how constant he was in labors, how free from all respect of persons he was in his proceedings against so many abuses in the Church, against every corruption in the ecclesiastical state and life; if we consider that he found the highest wisdom in this, 'To know Jesus Christ, the crucified' (1 Cor. ii, 2),—then we do not say too much when we designate him as a venerable witness of the truth, who, as a dignitary of the Church, did all he could in his day, and thus lived for all time, and manifested, his whole life, a zeal for a sound reform of the life of the Church."

Our author thinks, and perhaps not without much reason, that the character of the people among whom Wiclif was born and reared, had a formative, directing influence upon his life. He was born in the village of Spreswell, in the western part of the North-riding of Yorkshire.

"It was a strongly characterized region," says our author, "that the man, whose history we are writing, beheld in the days of his childhood and his boyhood. But we would be lost in the region of poetry, if we should attempt to picture to ourselves the influence which was exercised in the development of Wiclif's mind by the peculiarities of the region in which he was born and grew up.

"A sure point of support for the history of the man is given by the character of the population of those northern counties of England. In Yorkshire especially, but also in other counties of the north, as Northumberland, Westmoreland, and Cumberland, the old Anglo-Saxon element has maintained itself purer, more tenaciously and vigorously, than in the south of England. . . . It is said that to-day there are yet families there who, from the times before the Norman conquest (indeed, ever since the Saxon immigration), have remained uninterruptedly in the possession of their landed property. And it is added, moreover, that these old Anglo-Saxon families do not belong to the higher, but to the lower nobility, the gentry. . . . The entire character of the inhabitants of Yorkshire, their peculiar dialect included, appears as very ancient; they are known in England as substantial, honest, hardy men.

"From the midst of this thoroughly Germanic, tough old Saxon people came Wiclif. And the more the Germanic element in the English population bore the most decided part in the great national forward movements of the fourteenth century, the more significant, assuredly, is the circumstance that a man like Wiclif, who especially has done so much for the development of the Anglo-Saxon tongue, should belong to a district and a people that have ever been distinguished for a firm and faithful adherence to old Saxon spirit and manners. It appears, also, that the family of the Wiclifs belonged precisely to those branches of the lower nobility that maintained not only their possessions, but also their original Saxon character, with steadfastness for centuries."

It seems that, in the University of Oxford itself, the difference in character and tendencies between the north and south of England was decidedly marked, and that here Wiclif, as a member of the University, stood by the "north," and that this association was of strong moment to him there and in his after life.

"It is well known that all the universities of the Middle Ages were divided into 'nations,' according to the countries to which their members belonged. . . . Thus the English universities were also divided into 'nations.' In Oxford, however, there were but *two* of these, the northern and the southern—the *Boreales* and *Australes*. To the former belonged also the Scotch, to the latter the Irish and Welsh. Each nation also had its elected leader and representative, with the title *procurator* (whence *proctor*). That Wiclif belonged to the *Boreales*, as he came from the north, we might assume as a matter of course; but we have positive testimony that he was a *Borealis*. This, too, is not without its significance, since this nation maintained in Oxford, during the fourteenth century, not only the Saxon true Germanic national character, but also, in a prominent degree, the principle of national autonomy. Wiclif's association with this thus constituted 'northern nation' had a twofold consequence. In the first place, it had a decided influence on his own opinions and development of mind; and, in the second place, when he took his prominent, bold position before the English nation, and began to influence others, he found within the university in the nation of the *Boreales* a valuable body of nationally-related, like-minded men, the nucleus of a compact circle, of a party."

It would be most interesting to lay before the reader other extracts that would aid in giving some idea of the character of this great work, and awaken a desire to read it and *study* it; for it is for this that the author has designed it. The cursory reader will be interested; the patient student alone will appropriate its rich treasures. We have, however, perhaps already transcended the limits due here to a notice of a single author, although such a work of two massive volumes, together of 1397 pages, demands more than a meagre notice.

The second volume treats of the "Effects of Wiclif's Work" (*Die Nachwirkungen Wiclif's*) in England and on the Continent, especially in the Hussite movement. In this division of his work especially, the author brings forth the new historic treasures in Wiclif's history, found by him in Germany and Bohemia. All these several directions of the influence of Wiclif's life and writings are treated with a fullness of topics, richness of historical materials, thoroughness of discussion, and admirable masterly skill of historical development. This work of Dr. Lechler on the great English Reformer, will be hailed as one of the greatest contributions to the Reformation literature, and one of the noblest monuments of our day, of learning, patient research, and literary skill.